Global Performance of Associations

N. Mamdouh and S. Ahrouch

Abstract — This article seeks to deepen the notion of global performance for associations. In order to highlight the specificity of this concept for this type of structure, we proceeded, first, by observing and identifying the specific managerial practices and tools for Social and Solidarity Economy organizations. Second, we attempted to suggest a conceptual model of associations' performances that simultaneously takes into account the interactions between its different dimensions. The model will then be specified according to a structural equation model, which explains the causal relationships between the different dimensions of performance. Its validation is based on data collected from associations located in the Agadir Ida Outanane district-Morocco.

Index Terms — Global performance; Social and Solidarity Economy; association.

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of performance has been widely discussed lately in terms of its content and evaluation tools. In the context of Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE) organizations, multiples searches have been initiated to analyze, apprehend, and suggest management systems [1], making it possible to reconcile the concern for professionalism to that of global performance. The emergence of the notion of global performance constitutes a response to the new strategic challenges of organizations to take into account the requirements in terms of sustainable development and social and societal responsibility [2]. According to Baret [3], global performance (GP) is defined as “the aggregation of economic, social and environmental performance”. For Reynaud [4], GP is the combination of financial performance, social performance, and societal performance. In this sense, we can see the consensus on the triptych of the meaning of global performance, remains to know about the management of its dimensions. It is a question of searching for the existence of an integrated vision of all economic, social, and environmental aspects for measuring this performance.

The objective of this work is to shed light on the concept of global performance and to understand its dimensions through an abundant literature review allowing the construction of a conceptual model of representation of the global performance of associations. Thus, the article is organized into three parts. The first part deals with the definition and measurement of global performance, while the second presents the association sector and offers a conceptual model of representation and measurement of global performance that simultaneously takes into account the interactions between its different dimensions. The model will then be specified according to a structural equation model

which explains the causal relationships between the different dimensions of performance. Its validation is based on data collected from associations located in the Agadir Ida Outanane district, using a quantitative approach through a questionnaire targeting managers. Finally, the third part is dedicated to the presentation of the empirical study results and the testing of the hypotheses.

II. FROM PERFORMANCE TO GLOBAL PERFORMANCE

Historically, performance has been one-dimensional and looked at only from a financial perspective. This performance concept takes into consideration the satisfaction of shareholders' expectations (shareholders approach). Maximizing profitability, profit and return on investment was the ultimate goal of organizations to ensure their sustainability.

This purely financial perspective has met enormous criticism. Indeed, and in recent years, the logic of performance representation has shifted from a financial vision to a more global vision integrating social and environmental concerns. The appearance of other actors (stakeholders = stakeholders' approach) has changed the understanding of the notion of performance, which has experienced renewed interest with new acceptances. From now on, the sustainability of organizations no longer derives only from the satisfaction of shareholders' expectations but also includes the satisfaction of other stakeholders. Therefore, they require a response to their expectations, and this response is a vital condition for achieving performance and therefore the sustainability of organizations. Marmuse [5] specifies that “performance takes (...) multiple aspects, no doubt convergent, but which deserve to be approached in a more global logic than the sole appreciation of profitability for the company or the shareholder”. It is in this sense that the concept of global performance emerges.

A. The Emergence of Global Performance

The notion of global performance appeared in Europe during the 20th century with the emergence of the concept of sustainable development, but its origins can be traced back to older concepts, namely, social responsibility.

The emergence of the notion of global performance finds its beginnings based on the work of the working group of the General Planning Commission [6], which dates to 1997. The main contribution was that of Marcel Lepetit (organizational consultant and expert), who defined global performance “as a multidimensional, economic, social and societal, financial and environmental goal, which concerns both companies and human societies, as well as employees than citizens” [7]. As a result, the global performance is broken down according to

multi-criteria indicators and by various actors and is no longer measured according to a single dimension. Therefore, the relationships maintained between organizations and their environment, whether natural or societal, must be analyzed and evaluated [7].

Currently, global performance is used in managerial literature to assess the deployment of the concept of sustainable development by organizations [6]. Thus, Baret [3] and Reyaud [4] define this global performance as “the aggregation of economic, social and environmental performances”. In addition, for Germain and Trébucq [8], a performance is formed “by the combination of financial performance, social performance and societal performance”. In this context, the global performance consists of integrating the three performances in a synthetic approach, and “this integration implies a coherence between the three dimensions with causality models linking different factors from different dimensions” [2]. Although debates reveal different acceptances between organizations (private sector, public and social and solidarity economy) and between the Anglo-Saxon and European conception [1], producing confusion and ambiguity of the concept [9]. It can be said that global performance is based on a theoretical foundation postulating a social responsibility towards stakeholders and taking into account the provisions of sustainable development. So, in our article, we adopt, for its interpretation, the most frequent definition and that proposed by Reyaud [4]: “global performance is the aggregation of economic, social and environmental performance”.

Now, the definition of the concept of global performance has been clarified, the problem now lies in its measurement. Currently, the evaluation systems implemented do not integrate in a balanced way, the economic, environmental, and social dimensions, which does not make it possible to cover a wider scope of impacts [6]. These devices either assess performance separately or tend to measure at best the intersection of two performance dimensions.

In the next section, we present the set of tools and models offered for the assessment of global performance.

B. Global Performance Measurement

We can only speak of the performance if we can measure it [10]. In this sense, several initiatives have been developed to evaluate the global performance of organizations taking into account the three dimensions of sustainable development. However, and given the complexity of the concept of global performance, due to its multidimensional nature, no measurement model, integrating the three dimensions of sustainable development, has yet been designed. To measure their performance, organizations are content to use tools that measure, separately, each dimension of SD. For our study, we only deal with the tools for measuring global performance, namely: The Balanced Scorecard, the OVAR method, the Triple Bottom Line reporting and the GRI reporting (TABLE I).

TABLE I: TOOLS FOR MEASURING GLOBAL PERFORMANCE

Tools	Processed performance dimensions	Indicators	Reviews
Balanced Scorecard [11]	Financial perspective	Cash flow, Quarterly sales growth and operating income by division, and Increased market share and ROE	The model remains attached to the traditional version of the performance, namely, the pursuit of economic and financial objectives, given the hierarchy established between the four perspectives for the satisfaction of shareholders' expectations.
	Customer perspective	Percent of sales from new products, Percent of sales from proprietary products, On-time delivery (defined by customer), Share of key accounts' purchases, Ranking by key accounts, and Number of cooperative engineering efforts	
	Internal business perspective	Manufacturing geometry, vs. Competition, Cycle time Unit cost, Yield, Silicon efficiency, Engineering efficiency, Actual introduction, and schedule vs. plan	
	Innovation and learning perspective	Time to develop next generation, Process time to maturity, Percent of products that equal 80% sales, and New product introduction vs. competition	
GRI 200: Economic dimension	GRI 200: Economic dimension	201/ Economic performance;202/ Markt presence; 203/ Indirect economic impact;204/ Procurement practices; 205/ Anti-corruption; 206/ Anti-competitive behavior; 207/ Tax	This benchmark does not give an overall and integrated result through the use of sustainability indicators (sustainable development). It is content to offer an exploitable battery of quantified quantities, the relevance and construction of which are delegated to the experts, without dealing with the hidden conflicts between the dimensions of SD.
	GRI 300: Environmental dimension	301/ Materiels; 302/ Energy;303/ Water and influents; 304/ Biodiversity; 305/ Emissions;306/ Waste;307/ Environmental compliance;308/ Supplier environmental assessment.	
Standard GRI [12]	GRI 400: Social dimension	401/ Employment; 402/ Labor management relations; 403/ Occupational health and safety; 404/Training and education; 405/ Diversity and equal opportunity; 406/ Non-discrimination; 407/ Freedom of association and collective bargaining; 408/ Child Labor; 409/ Forced or Compulsory Labor; 410/ Security Practices; 411/ Rights of Indigenous Peoples;412/ Human Rights Assessment; 413/ Local Communities; 414/ Supplier Social Assessment; 415/ Public Policy; 416/ Customer Health and Safety;417/ Marketing and Labeling; 418/ Customer Privacy;419/ Socioeconomic Compliance.	The analysis of the global performance is carried out separately according to three dimensions (economic, social, environmental), which will subsequently be compiled without taking into account the interdependent relationships that exist between them. This is a simple translation of the three dimensions of sustainable development at the level of the Triple Bottom Line model without representation of causal links.
	Profit	Economic growth, Private profit, Market expansion, Economic stability, and Efficiency	
Triple Bottom Line [13]	People	Equity, Local self-reliance, Inclusion/ consultation, Empowerment, Participation, Social accountability, and Appropriate technology	
	Planet	Healthy ecosystems, Biodiversity, Supportive built environment, Resource conservation, and Pollution prevention	

Based on the review of models for measuring global performance, it can be seen that none of these measurement tools has proposed to integrate the three dimensions of sustainable development and to provide a global and integrated conception of performance. Indeed, these models present theoretical and methodological weaknesses, starting first from the ambiguity of the definitions proposed for the concept of performance, passing through the segmented and hierarchical vision of its dimensions, and finally the simplicity of the statistical methods used, which does not allow us to understand the complexity of the interactions between the various components of performance.

In the following part, we will present the association sector by highlighting its specificities in terms of its management system, and then suggest a model of representation of its global performance that takes into account its dimensions and their existing interactions.

III. THE GLOBAL PERFORMANCE OF ASSOCIATIONS

The search for performance is an increasingly important objective in the organizations of the Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE). It is the result of a convergence of the practices of these organizations in their daily activities. Historically, SSE actors have always been on the lookout for performance, whether through changes in their status or the meaning they gave to their social purpose and social utility.

Associations are the major component of SSE. They are constantly and increasingly questioned about their legitimacy to respond, in a specific and relevant way, to collective needs and / or to missions of general interest. This is why they must adopt a process for evaluating their global performance allowing their contribution to economic, social and environmental development to be highlighted while demonstrating their legitimacy to their stakeholders. It is in this sense that we conducted our research to suggest a model for representing and measuring the global performance of associations, in this case, those recognized as being of public utility.

A. Associations, Specific Organizations

The associations are defined as being “the convention by which two or more people pool, in a permanent way, their knowledge or their activity for an aim other than to share benefits” [14]. This definition highlights the fundamental characteristics of the association. It is a convention, a contract that connects members (at least two), permanently around a common, non-profit goal. The non-profit nature implies no distribution of profits generated by its activities among the members of the association. In addition, and as an organization of the SSE, associations are managed according to the principles of participatory democracy which refers to the rule of one person = one vote, which guarantees, for all members, the right to participate in decision-making and the election of management bodies.

The associative fabric has greatly developed given the multiplication of the number of associations, which has given rise to the categorization of these organizations. There are three categories: declared associations, recognized associations of public utility and foreign associations.

There is no reliable statistical data on associations in Morocco. However, a survey was conducted by the High Commission for Planning in 2007. According to this survey, Morocco had more than 130,000 associations in 2016 against 45,000 associations in 2007 (by counting associations, associations recognized as of public utility, foundations, etc.), an increase of more than 288% (The first annual government report on the partnership between the State and associations and organizations of civil society). This explosion is due to the National Initiative for Human Development (INDH), which has enabled an exceptional revival of the associative fabric. Since the 1980s, associations have been key players in literacy, microcredit, integration of the citizen with disabilities, the management of the problem of stray children, and women integration. However, the non-profit sector is faced with various constraints that limit the effectiveness of its actions in the field, despite the dynamism it demonstrates. These constraints are summarized in four main difficulties, namely: the mediocrity of financial means, the inadequacy of the legislative framework, the lack of infrastructure, and finally and mainly the absence of a mode of management and strategic planning allowing associations to demonstrate their performance by strengthening their effectiveness and efficiency to ensure their sustainability. Therefore, in the following section, we propose a model of representation and measurement of the global performance of associations, offering avenues for reflection on the implementation of management tools and devices adapted to the context of these specific organizations.

B. Proposal for a Model for Measuring the Global Performance of Associations

Like other organizations in the social economy, associations are defined by their mission and their purpose, which is to promote a fairer and more virtuous society, which implies a continuous self-assessment of the consistency between its principles and its practices. Despite the continuous changes in the economic and political environment, and the legal framework, the associative mode of operation has been based, from its inception, on “values” (solidarity, equality) and “principles” (democratic governance, freedom of movement, membership, non-profit). Like other types of organizations, and in an increasingly unpredictable world, associations are looking for global performance in order to ensure their sustainability by strengthening their legitimacy with their stakeholders.

In this context and under the light of the literature review, we proposed a conceptual model allowing the representation of the global performance of associations. This model takes into account the three dimensions of global performance as well as the causal and interaction links between these dimensions. The objective of our article is to elucidate the content of the global performance of associations and to understand the causal relationships between its different dimensions.

❖ Mobilized theories

For the development of our conceptual representation model of the global performance of associations, we referred to a diversified theoretical framework based mainly on the theory of stakeholders [15] and the resource-based view (RBV) [16], which allowed us to base our remarks and

consolidate our model. Indeed, the complementarity of the two theories has contributed to the definition of global performance as a multidimensional construct involving the aggregation of economic, social, and environmental dimensions. In addition, the two theories allowed us to explain the links between the dimensions of global performance, and with global performance. Thus, the character of our concept has brought out the need to use the systemic current to demonstrate that the global is more than the sum.

❖ *Specification of the conceptual model and research hypotheses*

In the light of the literature review of the notion of global performance, and taking into account the operating principles of associations, we have developed a model specific to associations allowing the representation and measurement of their global performance.

Fig. 1. Model representing the global performance of associations.

In this sense, our global performance measurement model deals with the interactions between economic performance, social and environmental performance according to the definition proposed by Reynaud [4]. Global performance depends directly on the achievement of intermediate performance which also depends on economic, social and environmental indicators.

Based on stakeholder theory, we accept the existence of a causal relationship between economic performance and social performance. For the impact of environmental performance on economic performance, it is analyzed by Ambec & Lanoie [17] and Laperrière [18], as having a positive effect. Regarding the relationship between social performance and environmental performance, the literature has not specified either the existence or not of a relationship or the meaning of this relationship.

Therefore, and based on our literature review, the variables of our conceptual model are presented in Table II.

TABLE II: THE JUSTIFICATION OF THE MODEL AND THE ITEMS OF THE MODEL

Dimension	Definitions	Measures	Definitions	Justifications
Global performance	Complex multidimensional construct involving the aggregation of the three dimensions of performance: economic, social and environmental [4]	Recognition of public interest Organizational legitimacy Organizational reputation Stakeholder satisfaction	Recognition remains a favor that the government grants to associations whose purpose meets a need of general interest The social acceptance resulting from adherence to regulative, normative or cognitive norms and expectations. Social comparison among organizations on a variety of attributes, which could include these same regulative, normative or cognitive dimensions. A stakeholder is an individual or a group of individuals who can affect or be affected by the achievement of organizational goals.	Dahir 1958 relating to associations [14] Dowling et Pfeffer [19]; Suchman [20]; Bitektine [21] Barnett et al. [22], Rhee et Valdez [23], Deephouse et Carter [24] Freeman [15], Clarkson [25]
Economic performance	Dimension linked to economic conditions favoring a solid financial position to ensure the viability of organizations	Ability to raise funds Sales Total assets Number of employees	Fundraising or fund-raising is the process of seeking and gathering voluntary financial contributions by engaging individuals, businesses, charitable foundations, or governmental agencies. corresponds to the income from the activities of the association (income from shows, sales of services ...) Total assets refer to the total amount of assets owned by a person or entity	Herman et Renz [26] Todor, Fielding et Porter [27] Griffen and Mahon [28], Cornett, Marcus and Lehranian [29], Richard, Barnett, Dwyer and Chadwick [30]
Social performance	The degree of satisfaction of the actors (Savall et Zardet [31])	Participative democracy social impact Solidarity Territorial anchoring	Refers to all the devices and procedures which make it possible to increase the involvement of citizens in political life and to increase their role in decision-making. All the consequences, of the activities of an organization both on its external stakeholders, direct or indirect in its territory and internal, then on society in general. Solidarity, understood as a principle or a moral value, is the expression of a mutual commitment that is established between two or more people. localized collective learning process in order to generate resources	Jean Gadrey [32]
Environmental performance	The appreciation of the efforts made by organizations to protect the environment	Pollution reduction Recycling practice Use of renewable energies	Provide information on management's efforts, decisions and actions to improve the environmental performance of the organization's operations.	Standards GRI [12]

Our hypothesis:

H1: General hypothesis considers global performance as a multidimensional construct jointly determined by economic, social, and environmental performance.

This hypothesis is verified by validating the following three sub-hypotheses:

H11: economic performance significantly and positively influences the global performance

H12: social performance significantly and positively influences the global performance

H13: environmental performance significantly and positively influences the global performance

H2: economic performance significantly and positively influences the social performance

H3: economic performance significantly and positively influences the environmental performance

H4: social performance significantly and positively influences the environmental performance

Based on our literature review and our conceptual model, we first specified the following structural equation model:

$$\text{PERFGLOB} = \alpha \text{PERFECO} + \beta \text{PERFSOC} + \gamma \text{PERFENV} \quad (1)$$

(Note that: Global performance = PERFGLOB; Economic performance = PERFECO; PERFSOC = Social performance; Environmental performance = PERFENV)

With

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PERFECO} &= \sum_{k=1}^n \text{ECO}; \text{PERFSOC} = \sum_{p=1}^n \text{SOC} \\ \text{PERFENV} &= \sum_{z=1}^n \text{ENVIR} \end{aligned}$$

To test our conceptual model, we opted for the case of associations in the Agadir Ida Outanane district through a quantitative approach carried out via a questionnaire administered to managers.

IV. RESULTS OF THE EMPIRICAL STUDY

The objective of our article is to suggest a model of evaluation of associations that takes into account, on the one hand, the multidimensional character of the concept of global performance, and on the other hand, the purpose, values, and practices of associations. In this regard, we took the case of associations located in the Souss-Massa region.

A. Research Methodology and Field of Study

The empirical study is based on the specification of a model of structural equations comprising a measurement model (the measurement scales of the constructs) and a structural model: the causal relationships between the overall performance and its dimensions, and the interactions between the different dimensions (Fig. 1). The validation phase is carried out on data collected from associations, because these organizations are particularly concerned by an overall performance extended to several dimensions, to assert their legitimacy with their stakeholders [33].

The data collection was operated according to a quantitative approach via the questionnaire method, which is fairly well answered in this type of study (determination of the structural equation model). The process of developing the questionnaire followed the most commonly used steps

recommended by Sekaran [34] and Sarantakos [35]. This questionnaire is structured on the basis of the conceptual model presented and includes a description of the association, economic and social performance indicators, and environmental. The responses to the questions are analyzed using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 5 (very satisfactory) to 1 (unsatisfactory). This scale design makes it possible to measure the respondent's satisfaction with the items [36], in order to obtain self-reported information on overall performance. Questionnaire validity is established using the content validity index to determine the relevance of the questions in the measurement of variables. Likewise, the reliability of the questionnaire is tested using Cronbach's α coefficient as recommended by Nunnally [37]. The results of the Cronbach coefficient α test should be ≥ 7 . All items should have a Cronbach coefficient α greater than 0.7, which implies that all items have created internal consistency.

Our study focuses on associations from Morocco located in Ida Outanane district - Agadir. The Social Affairs Division (DAS) has made available to us the district listing of associations located in the study area. We have chosen associations who existed for more than 15 years and which have a developed management system allowing them to respond to the various axes contained in our questionnaire that deals with the dimensions of performance. As a result, we administered the questionnaire to 200 associations and obtained 80 responses, 60 of which could be used (the invalid responses were canceled so as not to bias the statistical results). The following table III shows the characteristics of the sample.

TABLE III: THE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

		Size
Field of activity	Sociocultural	20
	Socioeconomic	30
	Professional	8
	Other	2
Age	From 15 to 20 years	20
	Over 20 years	40
	less than 250 members	12
Number of members	From 250 to 300 members	6
	From 300 to 500 members	20
	Over 500 members	16

B. Results and Discussions

We conducted our study using a quantitative approach guided by a questionnaire developed based on the variables identified in our conceptual model. The questionnaire was administered to the leaders of associations located in the Agadir Ida Outanane district. The model looks like this:

Fig. 2. Estimated structural equation model.

❖ The validity of the measurement model

Convergent validity of reflexive constructs: The convergent validity of the scales of the measurement model is assessed by observing the level and significance of the factor inputs generated by the PLS algorithm. Generally, factor analysis for structural equation models states high with significant contributions. We opted for the associated calculation formula proposed by Fornell & Larker [38] which corresponds to the average variance extracted (Average variance extracted, or AVE). In our case, the validity of our constructs is high and significant as is shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV: CONVERGENT VALIDITY OF CONSTRUCTS AND ITEMS

	Items	Index	External Charges *	Alpha Cross**	Ave***
Economic performance	Ability to raise funds	ECO1	0.962	0.928	0.822
	Sales	ECO2	0.916		
	Total assets	ECO3	0.812		
	Number of employees	ECO4	0.928		
Social performance	Participative democracy	SOC1	0.965	0.868	0.719
	Impact social	SOC2	0.948		
	Solidarity	SOC3	0.960		
	Territorial anchoring	SOC4	0.977		
Environmental performance	Pollution reduction	ENV1	0.924	0.848	0.758
	Recycling practice	ENV2	0.899		
	Use of renewable energies	ENV3	0.781		
	Recognition of public utility	GLOB1	0.832		
Global performance	Organization al legitimacy	GLOB2	0.955	0.923	0.875
	Organization al reputation	GLOB3	0.754		
	Stakeholder satisfaction	GLOB4	0.839		

External load * = coefficient must be greater than 70%.

Alpha cross ** = coefficient must be greater than 70%.

AVE *** = coefficient must be greater than 50%.

The discriminatory validity: the convergent validity of constructs can be accessed via the correlation of items concerning their constructs only with the other constructs of the model [39]. The SMARTPLS propose the table of cross-loadings allowing the examination of this characteristic.

TABLE V: CORRELATION OF LATENT VARIABLES

	PERFECO	PERFENVIR	PERFGLOB	PERFSOC
PERFECO	0.906			
PERFENVIR	0.787	0.870		
PERFGLOB	0.892	0.849	0.962	
PERFSOC	0.905	0.861	0.980	0.848

TABLE VI: DISCRIMINATORY VALIDITY OF ITEMS (CROSS LOADING)

Index	Economic performance	Social performance	Environmental performance	Global performance
ECO1	0.962	0.850	0.540	0.354
ECO2	0.916	0.777	0.681	0.733
ECO3	0.812	0.545	0.416	0.535
ECO4	0.928	0.322	0.223	0.787
SOC1	0.543	0.876	0.562	0.846
SOC2	0.452	0.955	0.752	0.875
SOC3	0.506	0.875	0.585	0.647
SOC4	0.473	0.893	0.532	0.768
ENV1	0.370	0.342	0.924	0.765
ENV2	0.233	0.432	0.899	0.624
ENV3	0.443	0.479	0.781	0.436
GLOB1	0.423	0.878	0.567	0.948
GLOB2	0.345	0.882	0.675	0.960
GLOB3	0.450	0.778	0.548	0.965
GLOB4	0.764	0.916	0.358	0.977

The analysis of the tables allowed us to deduce that the conditions necessary to guarantee the validity of the three reflexive constructs are satisfied: the homogeneity of the scales is sufficient; the convergent validity and the discriminant validity are assured and acceptable (except for social performance which is jointly determined by economic performance and environmental performance). Therefore, and after testing the measurement model, our conceptual model looks like this:

Fig. 3. Model representing the global performance of associations.

The structural equation model (1) is deduced as follows:

$$\text{PERFGLOB} = 0.022\text{PERFECO} + 0.946 \text{PERFSOC} + 0.017 \text{PERFENVIR}$$

❖ The Validity of the structure model

▪ Test of the hypotheses: to test our hypotheses, we calculated the coefficient of the paths (Table VII)

TABLE VII: PATH COEFFICIENTS

Hypotheses	Relations	Valeur t	Valeurs-p	Decision
H11	PERFECO->PERFGLOB	0.104	0.210	Rejected
H12	PERFSOC->PERFGLOB	7.376	0.000	Validated
H13	PERFENVIR->PERFGLOB	0.191	0.834	Rejected
H2	PERFECO->PERFENVIR	0.301	0.764	Rejected
H3	PERFECO->PERFSOC	43.650	0.000	Validated
H4	PERFSOC->PERFENVIR	6.377	0.000	Validated

To analyze the influence of intermediate performance on global performance, we have calculated the coefficient of determination (R2) and the influence coefficient (f2) which allowed us to know to what extent the global performance is explained and influenced by its dimensions, and how the dimensions are explained and influenced among each other.

TABLE VIII: COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION

Construct	R2	Appreciation*
Environmental performance	0.742	High
Global performance	0.961	High
Social performance	0.820	High

* R2> 0.67 means a high explanation of the constructs [40].

The result of the R2 test shows that the dependent variables (environmental, social, and global performance) are largely explained by the independent variables:

✓ Environmental performance is explained at 74% by social performance and economic performance.

✓ Social performance is explained at 82% by economic performance.

✓ 96% of the global performance is explained by economic, social, and environmental performance.

TABLE IX: THE SIZE OF THE EFFECTS OF INTERMEDIATE PERFORMANCE ON GLOBAL PERFORMANCE (f2)

		Variables explained		
		Environmental performance	Global performance	Social performance
Explanatory variables	Economic performance	0.001	0.002	4.546
	Environmental performance		0.002	
	Social performance	0.475	2.830	
	Global performance			

From Table IX, and according to the Cohen scale [41], we retain the following findings:

✓ Economic performance does not influence either environmental performance or global performance (f2 <0.02).

✓ Environmental performance does not influence the global performance (f2 <0.02).

✓ Social performance significantly influences global performance and environmental performance (f2> 0.35).

✓ Economic performance positively and strongly influences social performance (f2> 0.35), while it is not impacted by environmental performance (f2 <0.02).

✓ Social performance positively and significantly influences environmental performance (f2> 0.35).

Based on the results of our analysis, we can deduce that the global performance of associations mainly depends on social performance, which is influenced mainly by economic performance. As for environmental performance, it is explained by social performance. This implies the rejection of the first hypothesis stipulating the multidimensional character of global performance.

❖ The predictive validity of the model

To assess the validity of our measurement model and structural model and measure their ability to predict the global performance of associations, we opted for the coefficient of the goodness of fit (Table X):

$$(GOF) = \sqrt{(R^2) - (AVE)}$$

TABLE X: GOODNESS OF FIT OF THE MODEL

Constructs	GOF	Assessment of the goodness of fit *
PERFSOC	0.768	High
PERFENVIR	0.750	High
PERFGLOB	0.917	High

* scale proposed by Wetzel, Odekerken-Schröder, and Van Oppen [42].

We can thus argue that our measurement and structure model are valid and have a high quality of fit, which implies the validity of our findings.

V. CONCLUSION

Our research was based on a mixed theoretical framework making it possible to elucidate the content of the global performance of associations and to understand the links between its dimensions (social, economic, and environmental). In view of the results of our literature review, the global performance of associations is rarely studied and mentioned in research work. The objective of our article was to provide a model based on the method of structural equations to represent the global performance of this specific type of organization, and which jointly tests the relationships between its dimensions.

The results of our study show the significant and positive influence of social performance on global performance. Obviously, the nature of the organization studied implies this obvious relationship. Associations constitute the main component of the social and solidarity economy and pursue, by default, a social objective, namely the general interest and the search for the social utility of their activities. Furthermore, our results refute the significant effect of economic performance and environmental performance on global performance. Indeed, the model designed leads us to a significant hierarchy of the influence of the three dimensions of global performance, with strong domination of social performance (the influence of social performance constitutes more than 94%, followed by the influence of low economic performance (2%) then the influence of environmental performance. This leads us to question the integrated notion of global performance, in particular at the level of the organizations studied. As a result, the global performance of associations is a one-dimensional construct that depends mainly on social performance, which also depends on economic performance.

In this sense, integrated management of the global performance of its three dimensions is lacking. It seems obvious to us that the managers of associations neglect the economic and environmental aspects in the management of their performance and are satisfied with the social aspect. This segmented and hierarchical vision is due to the ignorance of the importance of the economic and environmental contribution to the achievement of global performance. The successor work of this study could suggest management tools and devices best compatible with the integrative approach or suggest innovative practices and activities that can meet this ambition.

REFERENCES

- [1] Acquier A., Aggeri F. (2007), «Une généalogie de la pensée managériale sur la RSE». *Revue française de gestion* 11 (180): 131-157.
- [2] Capron, M., Quairel-Lanoizelée, F. (2010). *La responsabilité sociale d'entreprise*. Paris: La Découverte, coll. Repères.
- [3] Baret P. (2006), «L'évaluation contingente de la Performance Globale des Entreprises: Une méthode pour fonder un management socialement responsable?», 2nd day of research du CEROS, pp. 1-24.
- [4] Reynaud E. (2003), «Développement durable et entreprise: vers une relation symbiotique», AIMS day, Sustainable development workshop, ESSCA Angers, pp. 1-15.
- [5] Marmuse, C. (1997). «Performance». In Joffre, P. et Simon, Y. (coord.), *Encyclopedie de gestion*, pp. 2194-2208.
- [6] Capron M., Quairel-Lanoizelee F. (2005), «Evaluer les stratégies de développement durable des entreprises: l'utopie mobilisatrice de la performance globale», Sustainable Development Day - AIMS - IAE d'Aix-en-Provence, pp.1-22.
- [7] Commissariat Général Du Plan (1997), *Entreprise et Performance Globale*, Economica, Paris, 256 p.
- [8] Germain C., Trébuq S. (2004), «La performance globale de l'entreprise et son pilotage: quelques réflexions», *social week Lamy*, pp. 35-41.
- [9] Pesqueux, Y. (2004), «La notion de performance globale en question», 5th International ETHICS Forum, Tunis.
- [10] Lebas, M.J. (1995), «Performance Measurement and Performance Management». *International Journal of Production Economics*, 41, p. 23-35.
- [11] Kaplan, Robert S. et Norton, David P., «The balanced scorecard-measures that drive performance», *Harvard Business Review*, Vol 71, n 1, January February 1992; «Putting the balanced scorecard to work», *Harvard Business Review*, Vol 71, n° 5, September October 1993.
- [12] GRI Standards, www.globalreporting.org/standards/.
- [13] Elkington J. 1997), *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*, Capstone Publishing, Oxford.
- [14] Dahir n 1-58-376 of 3 Joumada I 1378 (November 15, 1958) «règlementant le droit des associations», title I, article 1.
- [15] Freeman R. E. (1984), «Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach», Pitman, Boston.
- [16] Barney, Jay B., *Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage*. *Journal of Management* 17 (1) (1991): 99-120.
- [17] Ambec, S. and Lanoie, P. (2008), «Does it pay to be green? A systematic overview». *Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol. 22, n 4, p. 45-62.
- [18] Laperrière, J. (2012). ENV 788 Treatment and prevention of pollution, Lecture notes. Sherbrooke, University Center for Environmental Training (CUFE), University of Sherbrooke, 30 p.
- [19] Dowling, J., and Pfeffer, J., (1975), «Organizational Legitimacy: Social Values and Organizational Behavior». *Pacific Sociological Review*, 18, 122-136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1388226>.
- [20] Suchman, M.C., (1995), «Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches», *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 3, 571-610.
- [21] Bitektine, A., (2011), «Toward a Theory of Social Judgments of Organizations: The Case of Legitimacy, Reputation and Status», *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 1, 151-179.
- [22] Barnett. Michael. L., Jermier. John. M., and Lafferty. Barbara A., (2006), «Corporate Reputation: The Definitional Landscape». *Corporate Reputation Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1.
- [23] M Rhee, ME Valdez - *Academy of Management Review*, 2009 - journals.aom.org.
- [24] Deephouse. David., Carter. Suzanne., (2005), «An Examination of Differences Between Organizational Legitimacy and Organizational Reputation». *Journal of Management Studies*. 42. 329-360. [10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00499.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00499.x).
- [25] Clarkson M. B. E. (1995), «A Stakeholder Framework for Analysing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance», *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 20, pp. 42-56.
- [26] Herman, R.D., Renz, D.O. (2004). «Advancing Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness Research and Theory: Nine theses». *Nonprofit Management&Leadership* 18 (4): 339-415.
- [27] Dalton, D., Todor, W., Spendolini, M., Fielding, G., & Porter, L. (1980). *Organization Structure and Performance: A Critical Review*. *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 49-64. Retrieved October 18, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/257804>.
- [28] Griffin, J. and Mahon, J. (1997), «The Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance Debate». *Business and Society*, 36, 5-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000765039703600102>.
- [29] Cornett, M.M., A.J. Marcus and H. Tehranian, (2008), «Corporate governance and pay-for-performance: The impact of earnings management». *J. Financial Econ.*, 87: 357-373.
- [30] Richard, O.C., Barnett, T., Dwyer, S. and Chadwick, K. (2004) *Cultural Diversity in Management, Firm Performance, and the Moderating Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation Dimensions*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 255-266.
- [31] Savall, H., Zardet, V. (2001), «Evolution des outils de contrôle et des critères de performance face aux défis de changement stratégique des entreprises», 22nd AFC Congress.
- [32] Gadrey J., 2004, «L'utilité sociale des organisations de l'économie sociale et solidaire», synthesis report for DIES and MIRE.
- [33] Dameron, S., et Very, P. (2018), « Stratégie, information et diplomaties stratégiques : convergences et enjeux », *Finance Contrôle Stratégie* [En ligne], NS-3 | 2018, mis en ligne le 27 septembre 2018, consulté le 28 décembre 2020.
- [34] Sekaran, U. (2000). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- [35] Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social research* (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-14884-4>
- [36] Burns, N., & Grove, S. K. (2003). *The practice of nursing research: Conduct, critique and utilization* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders.
- [37] Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- [38] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981), «Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error». *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312>.
- [39] Lahmouz, K. and Duyck, J.P. (2008), «Implication organisationnelle et stress professionnel, rôle de l'auto-efficacité». Communication to the 29th AGRH Congress, Dakar.
- [40] Chin, W. W. (1998)., «The partial least squares approach for structural equation modeling. In G. A. Marcoulides (Ed.)», *Methodology for business and management. Modern methods for business research* (p. 295-336). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- [41] Cohen, J. (1988), «Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (2nd ed.)». Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- [42] Wetzels, M., Odekerken-Schröder, G., & Van Oppen, C. (2009). Using PLS Path Modeling for Assessing Hierarchical Construct Models: Guidelines and Empirical Illustration. *MIS Quarterly*, 33(1), 177-195. doi:10.2307/20650284.