

5-31-2021

## Competencies and Performance of Social Entrepreneurs in the Bicol Region

Crezel D. Barbonio-Obrero

*Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges*, barbonio.crezel@gmail.com

Maria Nina Cadano-Howard

*Ateneo de Naga University*, nenz1224@gmail.com

Nino Martin P. Obrero

*Bicol State College of Applied Sciences and Technology*, onin.obrero@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/socialtransformations>

---

### Recommended Citation

Barbonio-Obrero, Crezel D.; Cadano-Howard, Maria Nina; and Obrero, Nino Martin P. (2021) "Competencies and Performance of Social Entrepreneurs in the Bicol Region," *Social Transformations Journal of the Global South*: Vol. 9: Iss. 1, Article 6.

Available at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/socialtransformations/vol9/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Ateneo Journals at Archium Ateneo. It has been accepted for inclusion in Social Transformations Journal of the Global South by an authorized editor of Archium Ateneo.

# Competencies and Performance of Social Entrepreneurs in the Bicol Region

**Crezel D. Barbonio-Obrero**

Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges

**Maria Nina Cadano-Howard**

Ateneo de Naga University

**Nino Martin P. Obrero**

Bicol State College of Applied Sciences and Technology

This article examines the competencies and performance of organizations that prioritize the “triple bottom line,” emphasizing social or environmental and economic dimensions, known as social enterprises. Social enterprises are vehicles for inclusive growth and sustainable development because of their drive to respond to economic, social, and environmental problems. However, Filipino social enterprises still face significant obstacles to growth. With mixed methodology, the study found that social entrepreneurs in the Bicol region obtained high ratings in performance attributed to their high social responsibility results and a medium rating in business performance. This article illustrates that social enterprises in the Bicol region should improve their entrepreneurial quality to upgrade their business performance. Furthermore, the study may provide tips for social enterprises in the Philippines to improve their growth.

**KEYWORDS:** business performance; ethics; social entrepreneurship; social impact; social responsibility

## INTRODUCTION

The Philippines is one of the fastest growing economies in Asia with a 6.8% gross domestic product growth in 2018. If this is persistent, the government can expect that the country will attain upper middle-income status by 2022 (NEDA 2017). However, despite the growing economy, growth is not inclusive. Poverty levels remain high, opportunities are scarce, and the country faces a number of social and environmental challenges. Social enterprises can be part of the solution toward this challenge on inclusive growth and sustainable development.

Social enterprises are being endorsed internationally as primary agents for inclusive progress and sustainable development. A social enterprise can drive profit while responding to social or environmental challenges to improve the economy and local communities. Social enterprises differ from other organizations because they focus on unproductive parts of the market sector and areas underserved by the government.

Drayton (2002), CEO and founder of Ashoka, coined the term “social enterprises.” Ashoka: Innovators for the Public have structured the most prominent social enterprise system with solutions to resolve the public’s most persistent social difficulties since its founding in 1980. There are 30,000 social enterprises in the Philippines (Asian Development Bank 2017). Unfortunately, the policy environment is still unresponsive to the promotion and development of social enterprises (Dacanay 2012). There is, however, a pending bill in the Congress entitled Poverty Reduction through Social Entrepreneurship (PRESENT). This bill recommends a policy that encourages an atmosphere favorable to the growth of a lively social enterprise sector engaged in pursuing economic and social development. It also pushes for the acceptance of social enterprises as an inclusive growth strategy in development plans and facilitates the sector’s market integration and development (Aquino 2014). The bill’s presence shows the rising concern for social enterprises and the increase of recognition of their pivotal role to both the economy and society.

The Bicol region acknowledges the role of social enterprises in economic and societal development. Bicol is the fifth administrative region in Luzon. It has six provinces that include Camarines Sur, Camarines Norte, Albay, Sorsogon, Masbate, and Catanduanes. This recognition is reflected in the *Bicol Regional Development Plan 2017–2022*, stating that inclusive business models and social enterprises

shall be developed for better micro, small, and medium enterprises or MSMEs (NEDA 2017). Households shall be linked with social enterprises to capacitate them to engage in livelihood opportunities. The British Council (2017) report on the state of social enterprises in the Philippines has covered four organizations from the Bicol region. These are the Bulud Bees, Karaw Craft Ventures, People's Alternative Livelihood Foundation of Sorsogon Incorporated, Tao-Kalikasan Foundation of the Philippines Incorporated, and the Kalipunan ng Maliit na Magniniyog ng Barangay Kanapawan. This report shows that there is social entrepreneurship in Bicol and a need to explore other social enterprises in the area. Social enterprises embody a perfect model for micro and small enterprises and are desirable to mainstream MSMEs because of their more considerable societal impact. Hence, social enterprises should be given special treatment over MSMEs (Darko and Quijano 2015).

This article aims to assist in responding to inclusive growth challenges by providing a closer look at the present situation of social enterprises in the Bicol region using quantitative and qualitative forms. Specifically, this research will answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of performance of social enterprises in the Bicol region in terms of business performance and social responsibility?
2. In what specific areas do least performing social enterprises perform significantly lower than top performing social enterprises?
3. What is the level of social entrepreneurial competencies measured along with creativity, entrepreneurial quality, social consciousness, and ethics?
4. What specific competencies significantly influence the performance of social enterprises, particularly the least performing social enterprises?
5. What interventions can be recommended to address the level of performance and the level of competencies?

## **TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ANALYSIS**

The study is anchored on Elkington's (1994) triple bottom line, which explains that organizations should prepare three bottom lines: profit and loss, people, and planet accounts. The "profit account" is

the traditional measure of businesses, while the “people account” is the measure of how socially responsible an organization acts throughout its operation. Lastly, the “planet account” is a measure of how environmentally responsible the enterprise is.

To determine social entrepreneurs’ performance in the Bicol region, the study was guided by the Social Enterprise Quality Index (SEQI). The Philippine Social Enterprise Network formulated SEQI for monitoring and evaluating social enterprise performance in 2009. It reflects the Doing Well, Doing Good, and Doing Right triple bottom line. The principle of “doing well” refers to practices in business performance and enterprise management, “doing good” is about the social account, “doing right” talks about environmental and cultural practices.

Lastly, the study also utilized Ashoka’s four characteristics of a leading social entrepreneur. Ashoka has paved the way for social entrepreneurship and produced countless advances in committing the world to an agenda change since its establishment in 1980 by Bill Drayton. According to Ashoka, a leading social entrepreneur’s characteristics include creativity, entrepreneurial quality, social impact, and ethical fiber. Entrepreneurial competencies can use resources for improving micro-enterprise performance (Al-Mamun et al. 2016). Furthermore, several studies claimed that entrepreneurial competencies could improve enterprise performance (Chandra, Styles, and Wilkinson 2009; Faggian and McCann 2019; Mitchelmore and Rowley 2013). Thus, it is vital to enhance specific competencies that can facilitate strong performance (Gerli, Gubitta, and Tognazzo 2011). However, Kalyar and Rafi (2013) pointed out that formal strategic planning and humanistic culture are linked positively with corporate social responsibility. A company has to be socially responsible even though this is not a legal obligation (Aras and Crowther 2008).

Social entrepreneurs are affected by their level of performance, which includes two components. The first component is business performance (production, marketing, finance, and enterprise management). The second part is the social responsibility, comprising social and environmental practices. The level of performance of the social entrepreneurs in the Bicol region is the study’s dependent variable, while the independent variable pertains to social entrepreneurs’ social entrepreneurial competencies in the Bicol region presented as creativity, entrepreneurial quality, social consciousness, and ethics.

This is a system where their level of competencies influences their performance level. Thus, changes in any of the components of social

entrepreneurial competencies would affect business performance and social responsibility changes. This model also shows that social entrepreneurs may improve their performance level by improving specific competencies that have a strong influence on the dependent variable. The researcher will use any existing relationship between the two variables to recommend interventions for social entrepreneurs' improvement.

## **BICOL SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP SURVEY**

The study had respondents of forty (40) social entrepreneurs in the Bicol region for the research period of 2018–2019. Notably, the study involved six (6) social entrepreneurs from Camarines Norte, six (6) from Catanduanes, four (4) from Masbate, six (6) from Sorsogon, six (6) from Albay, and twelve (12) social entrepreneurs from Camarines Sur. The enterprises emphasize social and environmental missions where 0–24 percent of the income came from grants and the profit surplus was used for growth and development activities, reward to staff and beneficiaries, profit sharing, and cross-subsidizing for social or environmental activities. The majority of social entrepreneurs were retired from their previous professions and used the social enterprise as a new source of income. The study's respondents mainly offer raw or processed products and usually serve the local market. Respondents were identified in coordination with various government and non-government offices. The researcher administered the questionnaires' distribution and retrieval and verified the respondents' information through data from the Department of Trade and Industry's Negosyo Centers and local government units.

The instrument used to gather the needed data has three parts. The first part contains the necessary information, including the social enterprise's name, mission, and products. The second part presented the SEQI survey questionnaire from PhilSEN, which will measure social enterprises' performance levels. In 2009, PhilSEN formulated the SEQI survey questionnaire to offer a common performance standard to measure the status of social enterprises using the triple bottom line. This common standard includes “doing well (business performance and enterprise management), doing good (social responsibility), and doing right (practices relating to the environment and culture).” The survey utilized the third part to measure social entrepreneurial competencies. This part of the questionnaire was researcher-made based on a leading social entrepreneur's

characteristics, including creativity, entrepreneurial quality, the social impact of the idea, and ethical fiber (Ashoka 2018). The researcher used the definition of these social entrepreneurial competencies by Ashoka (2018) in formulating survey questions. The researcher also included a portion in the questionnaire to collect insights from the respondents regarding possible interventions to improve their weaknesses and maximize their strengths.

Academicians and industry experts evaluated the questionnaire, which was also subjected to pre-testing with fourteen (14) respondents. Pre-testing checks if questions work as intended and are understood. It also has the capacity to reduce sampling errors and increase questionnaire response rates (Drennan 2003). The number of participants in the pre-testing was challenged by the absence of an official social enterprise list in the Bicol region. A representative of the Social Enterprise Development Center (SEDCen) also gave feedback regarding the questionnaire. The researcher revised the tools based on the comments during the pre-test before its use in data gathering. However, the said questionnaire’s internal consistency was not validated, which is one of this article’s limitations.

In-depth interviews were conducted to clarify and validate any information relevant to the variables of the study. An interview guide was prepared based on the results of the study. The researcher adhered to the ethical standards to protect the privacy of the survey’s respondents. Also, the questionnaires answered by the respondents were kept with the utmost confidentiality.

To answer research question 1 (level of performance) and research question 3 (level of social entrepreneurial competencies), responses were tabulated and analyzed using simple frequency count and weighted mean. Regarding business performance, the respondents rated each indicator using the 5-point scale: 1 to *strongly disagree*, 2 to *disagree*, 3 to *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 to *agree*, and 5 to *strongly agree*. The researcher was guided by the SEQI interpretation below.

Range	Verbal Interpretation
3.68 – 5.00	High
2.35 – 3.67	Medium
1.00 – 2.34	Low

Table 1. SEQI Interpretation for Business Performance Rating

On the other hand, the survey questionnaire also used a scale of 1–5 for the ratings of social entrepreneurial competencies. The rating of 1 corresponds to *never*, 2 to *rarely*, 3 to *sometimes*, 4 to *usually*, and 5 to *always*. Interpretations were guided using the legend below.

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.40 – 4.19	High (H)
3	2.60 – 3.39	Average (A)
2	1.80 – 2.59	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very Low (VL)

Table 2. Survey Questionnaire Rating for Social Entrepreneurial Competencies

Regarding research question 2 (specific areas where least performing social enterprises perform significantly lower than top performing social enterprises), the researcher used mean difference and p-value to determine significant differences. A p-value less than alpha of 0.05 shows a significant mean difference, while a p-value higher than 0.05 cannot conclude that a significant difference exists.

For research question 4 (specific competencies that significantly influence the performance of social enterprises), the researcher used multiple regression to determine specific competencies that influence the performance of social enterprises. Furthermore, the study used in-depth interviews to support the research results and formulate its recommendations.

## RESULTS

### LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE: BUSINESS PERFORMANCE AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Table 3 shows that social enterprises have a “high rating” in performance (3.74), which can be associated with their level of business performance (3.51) and social responsibility (3.96). Business performance is also termed as Doing Well and refers to the need for the enterprise to have sustained earnings and financial independence

(PhilSEN 2009). It includes practices of social enterprises along production, marketing, finance, and enterprise management.

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
<b>1. Business Performance</b>	3.51	Medium
Production	3.33	Medium
Marketing	3.29	Medium
Finance	3.49	Medium
Enterprise Management	3.91	High
<b>2. Social Responsibility</b>	3.96	High
TOTAL	<b>3.74</b>	<b>High</b>
<i>n</i> = 40 <b>Legend:</b> 3.68–5.00 High 2.35–3.67 Medium 1.00–2.34 Low		

Table 3. Level of performance

LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE: PRODUCTION

Social enterprises attained a medium rating (3.33) in production. Production refers to the present level of technology, production processes meeting quality, delivery and price requirements, ability to define own standards of quality, and having a full-time entrepreneur. Based on survey results, this can be attributed to high ratings on having a full-time entrepreneur, the location of materials and the production area being far from pollution, and having skilled and experienced leaders together with medium ratings on the appropriateness of technology, skilled workers, and having defined quality standards and control.

The indicator ‘*enterprise has an entrepreneur or program champion who is devoted full-time*’ obtained the highest rating of 4.08 (high). Based on interviews, most social entrepreneurs commit eight (8) hours or more every day to manage their enterprises. Managing start-ups part-time may disadvantage the organization’s focus, efficiency, speed, and financial ability (Deeb 2015). During interviews, most social entrepreneurs have no other responsibility aside from the social enterprise since most were retirees or use the

enterprise as a source of income. However, other social entrepreneurs who have commitments see to it that they monitor the enterprise and have full-time managers.

Meanwhile, the indicator *'level of technology is adequate and appropriate'* obtained the lowest mean of 2.58 (medium). The respondents consider their technology level inadequate and not appropriate because they only use primary production and packaging tools. At the same time, some see their technology as tolerable for the current production level but recognizes the need to increase efficiency. The use of the right technology is essential to increase productivity (Elsey 2017). Some social enterprises use improvised machines, but these work slower and affect their products' quantity and quality. Furthermore, they cannot afford to buy the necessary machines due to financial constraints. Interviews revealed that some social enterprises are looking for grants but are discouraged by bulk paper requirements and lengthy processes.

Both the indicators *'workers/producers have basic technical/production skills'* (2.73) and *'defined quality standards and controls'* (2.75) attained medium ratings. Based on interviews, social enterprises employ the community members as workers or producers. Most of these community members have low educational attainment. Social enterprises aim to hire a local workforce, which requires lower costs and employs a more convenient hiring process. This practice also allows the enterprise to invest in the local community's growth and the local economy's health (Craig 2016). Although social enterprises make efforts to train this local workforce, it takes time and affects outputs. Achieving and sustaining quality control is a problem because finding skilled staff is difficult in remote areas (British Council 2017). However, the study found that most social enterprises conduct informal training and send workers to free trainings from the Department of Trade and Industry and the Department of Science and Technology.

## LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE: MARKETING

Social entrepreneurs attained a medium rating (3.29) in marketing. This refers to the marketability of products in terms of price, quality and consumer needs, attractive packaging, meeting the volume required by the market and having a marketing plan. Based on survey results, this can be attributed to a high rating on the marketability of products and neat packaging, to a medium rating in meeting the volume required, and a low rating on having a marketing study/plan.

The indicator '*products are marketable*' obtained the highest rating of 4.03. The result implies that social enterprises put premiums in ensuring that products are of high quality because product quality is a critical determinant of consumer satisfaction (Khan and Ahmed 2012). Respondents claimed that their products are marketable in terms of quality and consumer needs but are not sellable in price. Social enterprises have higher prices than their competitors due to the fair wages and fair prices they provide to workers and the higher production time due to low-level technology. These factors increase their operational costs, resulting in rising prices. One social enterprise in Camarines Norte explained that pricing needs to include fees of social and environmental activities. Additionally, a group of farmers in Tigaon, Camarines Sur uses a different approach through the selling of naturally grown vegetables at lower prices.

The indicator '*meeting the volume required*' attained a medium rating (3.13). Based on interviews, enterprises find it hard to meet the market's demand due to low-level technology, weather conditions, and an unskilled workforce. The work commitment of members is another reason for not meeting the production quota. Absenteeism among female workers is observed whenever they have family problems, while some do not report when they are employed part-time.

The lowest weighted mean is for the indicator '*has a market study/marketing plan*' (2.28). A marketing plan can be the roadmap to organizational success (Lavinsky 2013) as it identifies the target market, how to reach them, and how to keep them. The majority of social entrepreneurs in the Bicol region have minimal business knowledge and experience. Most social enterprises also claimed that they do have plans but that these are not written. The only notable marketing strategy is the use of social media. The majority of the social enterprises created Facebook pages to increase public awareness about their products and to easily communicate with potential customers.

## LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE: FINANCE

Social enterprises attained a medium rating (3.49) in finance. Finance refers to the established financial controls and procedures, increase of sales, and independence from grants. Based on survey results, this can be attributed to high ratings on independence from grants, an increase in sales, and a medium rating in having established financial control, system, and procedure.

The indicator *'enterprise has not depended entirely on grants'* obtained the highest rating of 3.95 (high). The majority of social enterprises were financially funded by their founder/s. Independence from grants is good for a social enterprise. Grants are suitable for early-stage support. Social enterprises need to build their revenue streams (British Council 2017) to become more sustainable than nonprofit organizations that rely only on grants or donations (Narula 2017). Social enterprises involved in the study did not receive any financial aid in the past three years. But they received assistance from the government and private organizations for mentoring, shared service facilities, seminars, and training.

However, social enterprises should evaluate financial performance because the indicator *'financial controls, systems, and procedures are in place'* received the lowest weighted mean of 2.80 (medium). Based on interviews, very few social enterprises have employed bookkeepers to monitor financial performances. This can be related to the finding that most social entrepreneurs lack business knowledge, skills, and experiences. The research also found that social enterprises rely on taking note of their sales but have not monitored their financial status. Poor records can lead to economic inefficiency, which leads to poor organizational performance (Ademola, James, and Olore 2012). A social enterprise in Pandan, Catanduanes expressed that keeping records of expenses is stressful. Helping the community is the right motivation, but social enterprises should not disregard financial performance.

## LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE: ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT

Social enterprises achieved a high rating (3.91) in enterprise management. Enterprise management refers to clear goals, compliance to Fair Trade principles, use of a strategic plan and legal personality, registration with government offices, financial transparency, gender-fair hiring policy, continuing program for skills development, mobilizes partnership and promotes philosophy of creating value beyond wealth.

Based on survey results, this can be associated with high ratings in registration with government agencies, having a legal personality, and gender-fair hiring policy; a medium rating in having a program to upgrade skills, inform stakeholders about finances; and a low rating in having a strategic plan.

The indicator '*enterprise is registered with SEC or other government agencies/bodies*' obtained the highest rating (4.95). Social enterprises put a premium on securing permits as required by the government. Salam and Naheer (2014) approximate that 25 percent of social enterprises in the Philippines have become multi-organizational systems that combine stock, for-profit corporations, and nonstock, nonprofit corporation forms to administer the provision of different types of products. On the other hand, social enterprises in Bicol are mostly registered as a sole proprietorship, which they view as the most comfortable form of business to register.

The indicators '*continuing program to upgrade skills*' (2.70) and '*enterprise informs stakeholders on financial status*' (2.98) both received medium ratings. Survey results show that the continuing program's medium rating can be attributed to the common practice of coaching among workers and availing of free government training. On the other hand, some social enterprises inform stakeholders about financial status through meetings, bulletin boards, and compiling documents. However, other social enterprises could only impart partial information about financial performance since most social enterprises have no financial control, system, and procedures.

The lowest weighted mean obtained is 2.18 (low) on the indicator '*there is a strategic plan that guides the enterprise*,' another area that can be a cause of concern. The majority of social enterprises expressed no comprehensive marketing plans and placed financial controls and procedures. Such a result can again be associated with the lack of formal business education. Moreover, the study found that although social entrepreneurs were college graduates, their workers have low educational attainment. This situation is similar to that of a social enterprise in Camarines Norte. "*Wala akong miyembro na pwede i-assign sa strategic planning kasi halos lahat sila hindi nakapagtapos ng college*" (I do not have a member that I can assign in strategic planning because a majority of them are not college graduates). Meanwhile, a social enterprise in Sorsogon emphasized the lack of time as a constraint in strategic planning. "*Alam ko importante siya, kaso dahil sa dami ng responsibilidad ko 'di ko na napaprioritize*" (I know it's important, but because of a lot of responsibilities, I can no longer prioritize it).

## LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE: SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Social responsibility refers to an enterprise encouraging social transformations and change and promoting policies and practices that safeguard and promote ecology and renewable energy systems, upholding gender equity and cultural diversity and promoting stakeholder engagement and partnership in any project. In the study, this involves good practices of social entrepreneurs such as helping marginalized communities, benefits being widely distributed, the promotion of social development through education and skills training, sourcing and semi-processing raw materials from and with the community, and providing jobs and additional income. It also refers to not using toxic or banned substances, regeneration of raw materials, proper waste disposal, recycling, use of appropriate and renewable technology, promotion of conservation and protection of local resources, enhancement of indigenous knowledge and skills, and practicing gender equity in hiring and labor practices.

The level of performance in social responsibility attained a high rating (3.96). Social responsibility and business performance are some of the components of performance. Social entrepreneurship is at the intersection of social mission, market orientation, and innovation (Nicholls 2006). Thus, social responsibility is a permanent factor in social entrepreneurship. Survey results show high ratings on gender-equity hiring and labor, raw materials semi-processed by the community, and the enterprise's location within a marginalized community. They also attained a medium rating promoting social development and a low rating in renewable technology and in stakeholders' contributions.

The indicator *'practices gender equity in hiring and labor practices'* obtained the highest rating of 4.93 (high) because of neutral and non-discriminatory policies. During interviews, the researchers found that social enterprises accept both male and female applicants in any job opening as long as they can perform the tasks. It is noteworthy to learn that there are many female members among social enterprises in the Bicol region. Women in marginalized communities are becoming more participative in employment and social activities.

The indicator *'raw materials are semi-processed by the community'* obtained a high rating (4.90). Social enterprises' production areas are within the community and employ the members of the community. Respondents explained that they involve the community because their social mission is to empower and provide

income opportunities. Many social enterprises in the Philippines are producer-based organizations, operational with low-income, and marginalized crowds of producers and suppliers (Darko and Quijano 2015), either directly engaged in the business as processors or are given access to essential services (Ballesteros and Llanto 2017).

Furthermore, a high rating was also attained by the indicator *'enterprise is based in a marginalized community'* (4.73). During interview visits, most social enterprises were situated in communities that experience social, environmental, and economic issues. For instance, one social enterprise in Sorsogon sends its members to college to reduce out-of-school youth. In contrast, another social enterprise in Camarines Norte employed indigenous people as suppliers of raw materials.

The indicator *'enterprise promotes social development'* (3.55) attained a medium rating related to the medium rating along a continuing program to upgrade workers' skills and know-how. Social enterprises promote social development through coaching and sending them to free activities of government offices. Social enterprises are also active in educational activities that cater to outsiders, such as educational tours of schools and government units. These activities provide them with additional income and also helps in promoting social enterprise.

One of the lowest weighted means is 1.95 (low) on the indicator *'uses appropriate and renewable technology.'* During interviews, the researchers observed that there were only a few social enterprises with solar panels. Some have the intention to procure renewable technology, but do not have the budget for this. Social enterprises are founded by people who are financially at a disadvantage. Hence, these organizations are more likely to have inadequate access to resources and networks (Ballesteros and Llanto 2017). One social enterprise in Catanduanes used an improvised solar dryer for production. However, the fabrication cost was still expensive and the machine had a lot of technical limitations.

The lowest weighted mean obtained is 1.68 (low) on the indicator *'PO/stakeholders contribute at least 10% of the capital or assets of the enterprise.'* Even if social enterprises brought employment and empowerment, stakeholder ownership and responsibility is still low. A respondent shared that the community usually sees a social enterprise as a job generator and income provider. Yet, very few members take ownership and appreciate how it improves their quality of life. This is related to Villar's (2011) study that noted that the community members should be able to earn a living from the projects as part of the social enterprise's sustainable initiatives.

It is good to note that social enterprises have a high standing in social responsibility. However, it is alarming that they have weak points in business performance. This aspect reflects the economic feature of a social enterprise; thus, it is responsible for generating funds. This is crucial because economic sustainability is essential to keep the enterprise alive and continue social and environmental activities. Social enterprises should be economically sustainable; otherwise, the new socioeconomic equilibrium will require a constant flow of subsidies (Osberg and Martin 2015), which cannot be guaranteed. No matter how high the social and environmental levels are, poor business performance may bring death to the social enterprise.

### LEAST PERFORMING SOCIAL ENTERPRISES PERFORM SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER THAN TOP PERFORMING SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

Table 4 shows a significant difference in the business performance between the five top-performing social enterprises ( $p < 0.05$ ) and the five least performing social enterprises. The significance value of 0.00 in all business performance components shows significant differences since the significance value is lower than the 0.05 level (2 tailed).

Measure	Top 5 Weighted Mean	Least 5 Weighted Mean	Mean Difference	Sig.
<b>Performance</b>	4.67	3.26	1.41	0.00
1. Business Performance	4.62	2.62	2.0	0.00
A. Production	4.51	2.46	2.05	0.00
B. Marketing	4.5	2.38	2.12	0.00
C. Finance	4.7	2.6	2.1	0.00
D. Enterprise Management	4.77	3.02	1.75	0.00
2. Social Responsibility	4.73	3.9	0.83	0.00
<i>The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)</i>				

Table 4. Areas where least performing social enterprises perform significantly lower than top performing social enterprises

There were significant differences between the top performers and least performers regarding their business performance (production, marketing, finance, and enterprise management) and social responsibility. These differences show that the five top performing social enterprises have a higher mean. Social enterprises need to realize that commercial practices are detrimental to social enterprises because they are heterogeneous organizations trying to balance sustainability and social responsibility (Dacanay 2012). Unlike traditional enterprises that focus only on earning a profit, social enterprises find it challenging to perform business operations while concentrating on social or environmental missions.

### THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURIAL COMPETENCIES

Table 5 shows that social enterprises have a high rating (3.95) in social entrepreneurial competencies. It refers to the entrepreneurial competencies of social entrepreneurs in the Bicol region for creativity, entrepreneurial quality, social impact, and ethical fiber (Ashoka 2018). This rating can be associated with their average level of creativity and entrepreneurial quality and a very high social consciousness and ethics level.

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Creativity	3.34	Average
2. Entrepreneurial Quality	3.39	Average
3. Social Consciousness	4.32	Very high
4. Ethics	4.74	Very high
TOTAL	<b>3.95</b>	<b>High</b>

*n* = 40
 **Legend:** 4.20–5.00 *Very High*  
                   3.40–4.19 *High*  
                   2.60–3.39 *Average*  
                   1.80–2.59 *Low*  
                   1.00–1.79 *Very Low*

Table 5. Level of Social Entrepreneurial Competencies

Social enterprises attained an average rating (3.34) in creativity. Creativity arises from the confluence of knowledge, creative thinking, and motivation. In the study, creativity refers to the practices of social entrepreneurs regarding innovation, goal setting, problem solving, motivation, and environment. This includes the practices of trying very new and different things, brainstorming with other people, thinking about the future, looking for new solutions to problems and working with creative people, among others.

This competency brings new ideas to social enterprises. Dissatisfaction with the status quo usually encourages social enterprises to think of new approaches to solve problems encountered (Guclu, Dees, and Anderson 2002). Based on survey results, this rating can be attributed to high ratings on not quitting until getting things right, discontentment with the present ways of doing things, and looking for new solutions, together with their average ratings in working with creative people and thinking about the future. Notably, social enterprises attained low ratings in being transparent with goals.

The indicator *'will not quit until I get things right'* obtained the highest rating of 3.93 (high). Social entrepreneurs understand that they have to remain persistent (Else 2017). Passion is the driving factor for a social enterprise in Albay to push through even in challenging times. *"Ito kasi talaga ang gusto ko'ng garwin. I want to help my fellow women"* (This is what I want to do. I want to help my fellow women). This sense of responsibility is the motivation of a social enterprise in Camarines Norte that focuses on the beneficiaries' welfare. *"Kung di namin 'to gagawin ng maayos, hindi ko alam kung ano ang mangyayari sa mga IPs na umaasa sa amin."* (If we do not do things right, I do not know what will happen to the indigenous people who depend on us).

Also, the indicators *'not contented with the present ways'* (3.90) and *'looks for new solutions'* (3.90) attained high ratings. Social entrepreneurs usually see solutions that do not yet exist (Else 2017). During the in-depth interviews, most respondents expressed their discontentment with the present ways in their social enterprises. A social enterprise in Catanduanes has identified several weak areas, particularly in the production aspect that she wants to improve in.

Marami pa talagang dapat i-improve. First and foremost, hindi ako kontento sa technology namin kasi binibilad lang ang mga dahon sa init ng araw, which is very dependent on weather conditions. Ang hirap mag produce kapag rainy season. Second, attitude and skills ng mga members

namin dapat baguhin. Tinutulungan ko sila pero parang yung iba, sila mismo ang ayaw tulungan ang mga sarili nila. Kaya naapektuhan ang quality ng products namin. (There is still a lot to improve. First and foremost, I am not contented with our technology because we dry the leaves under the heat of the sun, which is very dependent on weather conditions. It is hard to produce during the rainy season. Second, the attitude and skills of the members should be improved. I am helping them, but some members do not want to help themselves. These affect the quality of our products.)

These findings can be related to the medium ratings in production along with the workers' technical skills, adequacy, and appropriateness of technology and on defined quality standards and control. Moreover, this can be related to the high rating of looking for new solutions to existing problems. Social enterprises look for new solutions because they are not content with existing solutions. One social enterprise in Sorsogon allows members to brainstorm for new solutions and permits them to execute these solutions.

On the other hand, the indicators '*works with creative people*' (2.70) and '*thinks about the future*' (2.63) both attained average ratings. Based on survey results, the average rating in working with creative people can be attributed to community members' employment as workers of the social enterprise to give them jobs. This can also be attributed to the high rating on policies that are gender fair and do not discriminate against the disabled as long as skills requirements are met. For social enterprises, people and their needs are at the center of organizational attention (IESE Business School 2015). Regarding thinking about the future, survey results show that the average rating can be attributed to the finding that some social enterprises only think of the future during annual meetings. This concept indicates that most social enterprises do not prioritize thinking about the future.

The study also revealed the lowest weighted mean of 2.55 (low) on the indicator '*very clear about goals*.' This rating can be related to the average rating of thinking about the future. Since most social enterprises do not envision their future status, they may find it hard to identify goals. However, having clear goals mobilizes focus on behavior (Boss 2017). Thus, social enterprises should improve plans to ensure their economic, social, and environmental mission.

Concerning entrepreneurial quality, social enterprises attained an average rating (3.39). It is the set of characteristics linked with

the positive growth of new businesses. Competencies can range from personality and individual inspirations, to particular knowledge and abilities. In the study, entrepreneurial quality refers to the practices of social entrepreneurs related to persistence, opportunity seeking, risk taking, quality and efficiency, and independence and self-confidence. It includes spending a lot of time trying to find a solution when faced with a difficult problem, liking challenges and new opportunities, weighing chances of succeeding or failing, seeking the advice of people, and feeling confident, among others.

Survey results show that this can be attributed to their high ratings on trying several ways to reach their goals, doing things that need to be done before being asked, and spending a lot of time to find a solution. Social enterprises also attained average ratings in seeking people's advice and having better work than other people and low ratings in weighing chances of succeeding and failing.

The indicator *'tries several ways to reach goals'* obtained the highest rating of 4.13 (high). This rating is consistent with the level of creativity where they attained high ratings along with indicators of not quitting to get things right and is not contented with present ways of doing things and looking for new solutions to existing problems. Such competency is good, but it has disadvantages. During the in-depth interview, most social enterprises relayed their experiences of failing continuously in their attempt to achieve their goals. One social enterprise in Sorsogon shared, "*Kapag may suggestion sila, binibigyan ko sila ng pera para ma implement yun. Kaya lang minsan, we end up wasting money*" (I give them funds to implement their suggestion, but sometimes we end up wasting money).

Social enterprises using several ways to achieve goals can also be attributed to low ratings along with having very clear goals, having a study or marketing plan, and a strategic plan. Planning can be an avenue to have clear goals and analyze ways to achieve these goals.

Also, average ratings were achieved by the indicators *'seeks the advice of people'* (2.90) and *'work is better than that of other people'* (2.90). Some social enterprises seek the advice of government offices such as local government units, DTI and DOST, and business experts. They also generate advice from members through brainstorming. In contrast, others consult their family. The same average rating on having better work than other people shows that some enterprises are not confident with their performances. A social enterprise in Camarines Sur pointed out that the quality of products is affected by the workers' attendance and quality of work.

Madami kaming members, pero konti lang ang active sa production. Kaya lang ang mahirap pa eh, yung mga active workers na yun, hindi pa masyadong skilled. Noong nagtrade fair kami one time, may isang tsinelas na may depekto, di ata nadikit ng maayos. Pero hindi ko sila pwede alisin, kasi sila lang ang mga active members ko. (We have a lot of members, but very few are active in the production. But the problem is those active workers were not that skilled. When we had a trade fair, there was one slipper with defects, maybe it was not pasted properly. But I cannot fire them because they are my only active members.)

A social enterprise in Catanduanes shares the same situation on how workers affect the products' quality. "*Ang ibang mga miyembro gusto gumawa ng kanya kanya. Ni hindi nga nag aattend ng meeting, tapos pupunta lang sakin kapag may kailangan na gamit*" (Some members wanted to produce on their own. They do not attend meetings and will only visit me if they need tools).

Other social enterprises shared that their inferior work is due to the limited budget and poor business knowledge. This may be related to the medium level of technology (2.58), workers' technical skills (2.73), and definition of quality standards and controls (2.75). Also, it can be related to low ratings on having marketing plans (2.28), in established financial controls and systems (2.80), and having a strategic plan (2.18).

The lowest weighted mean obtained is 2.73 (average) on the indicator '*comfortable about situations with uncontrollable outcomes.*' Social enterprises shared that they are afraid of failure but will continue and are willing to take risks. This good quality reflects their high ratings on trying several ways to reach goals (4.13) and spending a lot of time to find a solution for a difficult problem (4.00). The average level of comfort can be accounted for low ratings on having marketing plans (2.28), in established financial controls and systems (2.80), and having a strategic plan (2.18). Social enterprises may take calculated risks and reduce discomfort if they have written plans.

Moreover, social enterprises attained a very high rating (4.32) in social consciousness. Social consciousness is a competency of being mindful about social issues and acting upon the social awareness. In the study, social consciousness refers to the practices of social entrepreneurs related to input, processes/activities, output, outcome, and goal alignment. This involves social entrepreneurs having a

clear environmental and/or social mission, having a clear idea of its beneficiaries, seeking the support of other people, utilizing the mission as a basis in the selection of activities, and going through monitoring and evaluation to ensure that all are aligned to the mission. Based on survey results, this can be attributed to very high ratings on having a clear social or environmental mission, a clear idea about beneficiaries, and willingness to commit time, effort, and resources, together with an average rating in monitoring and evaluation.

The indicator *'has a clear social and/or environmental mission'* obtained a very high rating (5.00). Interviews showed that social enterprises started first with social or environmental missions. Social ventures want to have the most significant impact possible on social problems (Bloom 2009). The missions involve employment, education, wellness, empowerment, and environmental protection. Social entrepreneurs chose these missions based on the available resources and the community's needs and addressed the community's social problem (Dacanay and Morato 2004; ISEA 2015). For instance, a social enterprise in Camarines Sur pursued organizing farmers to use natural farming because of the availability of agricultural lands. In contrast, one social enterprise in Masbate protects marine life because dynamite fishing and pollution were rampant in the community.

The indicators *'clear idea about the beneficiaries'* (4.95) and *'willing to commit time, effort, and resources'* (4.83) received very high ratings. The clarity of social enterprises regarding their beneficiaries can be related to the high level of clear missions because they are also involved in their missions. Moreover, a high rating on willingness to commit time, effort, and resources can account for high ratings on having a full-time entrepreneur (4.08) and independence from grants (3.95). Most social enterprises have no other responsibilities than to fully commit to the enterprise with most using their own money to finance the enterprise. Their high ratings on perseverance (*'not quitting until they get things right'* rated at 3.93), ingenuity (*'trying several ways to reach their goals'* rated at 4.13), and devotion to problem solving (*'spending a lot of time to find a solution'* rated at 4.00) also reflect their willingness to commit.

The lowest weighted mean obtained is 3.35 (average) on the indicator *'conducts monitoring and evaluation'*, which can be attributed to low ratings on having marketing plans (2.28), in established financial controls and systems (2.80), and having a strategic plan (2.18). Since most enterprises do not have written plans, they also do not have the basis for monitoring and evaluation. These findings

are like those of Dacanay (2004) where only a few social enterprises recorded impact data with some not recording any.

Lastly, social enterprises attained a very high rating (4.74) in ethics. Ethics is the collective understanding of the moral standard, philosophy, politics, and law that serve as a guide for businesses to function ethically and a moral standard to manage corporate behavior. In the study, ethics refers to the practices of social entrepreneurs related to trust, fairness, transparency, honor, and respect. This includes treating everyone equally, conveying facts transparently, and acting consistently with organizational values, communicating to the team, and not tolerating discrimination at work. Survey results show that this can be attributed to very high ratings in all indicators, such as not tolerating discrimination, treating everyone equally, showing respect to business partners, and not committing any action to ruin trust.

The indicator '*does not tolerate discrimination*' obtained a very high rating (5.00). This rating can be attributed to high ratings on having a gender-fair hiring policy and not discriminating against the disabled (4.73) as seen through gender equity in labor practices, developing skills, and providing equal opportunities. Since social enterprises aim to employ the community, they accept anyone who is willing to work. One social enterprise in Albay has members who are out-of-school youth, indigenous people, physically challenged individuals, pregnant women, and senior citizens.

Other indicators received very high ratings, including the indicators '*treats everyone equally*' (5.00), '*shows respect to business partners*' (5.00), and '*does not commit any action to ruin trust*' (5.00). The very high level of equal treatment to everyone and respect for business partners can be attributed to the very high level of intolerance for workplace discrimination. Social enterprises claim that equal treatment and care together with trust form part of their social missions. Most social entrepreneurs shared that they have not committed any action that might ruin confidence because they do not want to tarnish the reputation of their social enterprises. The indicator '*can attest that employees will do their jobs*' obtained a rating of 4.25 (very high). With social enterprises providing employment to a variety of individuals, it is unsurprising that the members are committed to doing their jobs.

## COMPETENCIES THAT INFLUENCE THE PERFORMANCE OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

This section shows the competencies that influence the level of business performance and social responsibility of social entrepreneurs. The results of the regression analysis are presented below.

<b>(6a) Regression Statistics</b>		
Multiple R	0.9648	
R Square	0.9301	
Adjusted R Square	0.9230	
Observations, $n$	40	
<b>(6b)</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>p-Value</b>
Intercept	0.2972	0.8052
Creativity, $X_1$	-0.0623	0.8596
Entrepreneurial Quality, $X_2$	0.7900	0.0333
Social Consciousness, $X_3$	0.1974	0.2331
Ethics, $X_4$	-0.0240	0.9315
Regression Model: $Y_a = 0.2972 - 0.0623X_1 + 0.79X_2 + 0.1974X_3 - 0.0240X_4$ where: $Y_a$ = Business Performance $X_1$ = Creativity $X_2$ = Entrepreneurial Quality $X_3$ = Social Consciousness $X_4$ = Ethics		

Table 6. Multiple Regression: Business Performance along with the competencies

Table 6a shows that the regression model for business performance has a 93.01% “goodness-of-fit.” This result can infer a 96.48% probability that the model will hold when this is done  $n$  times. Among the four competencies, entrepreneurial quality has a strong influence on business performance with a 0.79 coefficient. Social consciousness also indicates a positive effect at 0.197, while a negative effect exists between creativity and business performance (-0.062) and ethics and business performance (-0.024). However, only the entrepreneurial quality shows a statistical impact on business performance with a p-value of 0.0333 (Table 6b).

<b>(7a) Regression Statistics</b>		
Multiple R	0.9688	
R Square	0.9385	
Adjusted R Square	0.9315	
Observations, $n$	40	
<b>(7b)</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>p-Value</b>
Intercept	-0.6125	0.6220
Creativity, $X_1$	0.1678	0.6440
Entrepreneurial Quality, $X_2$	0.6097	0.1057
Social Consciousness, $X_3$	0.2337	0.1719
Ethics, $X_4$	0.0639	0.8245
Regression Model: $Y_1 = -0.6125 + 0.1678X_1 + 0.6097X_2 + 0.2337X_3 + 0.0639X_4$ where: $Y_1$ = Production		

Table 7. Multiple Regression: Production along with the competencies

<b>(8a) Regression Statistics</b>		
Multiple R	0.9442	
R Square	0.8915	
Adjusted R Square	0.8791	
Observations, $n$	40	
<b>(8b)</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>p-Value</b>
Intercept	0.7572	0.6283
Creativity, $X_1$	-0.1473	0.7470
Entrepreneurial Quality, $X_2$	0.9208	0.05042
Social Consciousness, $X_3$	0.1159	0.5862
Ethics, $X_4$	-0.1250	0.7305
Regression Model: $Y_2 = 0.7572 - 0.1473X_1 + 0.9208X_2 + 0.1159X_3 - 0.1250X_4$ where: $Y_2$ = Marketing		

Table 8. Multiple Regression: Marketing along with the competencies

<b>(9a) Regression Statistics</b>		
Multiple R	0.9606	
R Square	0.9228	
Adjusted R Square	0.9140	
Observations, $n$	40	
<b>(9b)</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>p-Value</b>
Intercept	0.2235	0.8697
Creativity, $X_1$	-0.1841	0.6443
Entrepreneurial Quality, $X_2$	0.9670	0.0220
Social Consciousness, $X_3$	0.2048	0.2732
Ethics, $X_4$	-0.0589	0.8524
Regression Model: $Y_3 = 0.2235 - 0.1841X_1 + 0.9670X_2 + 0.2048X_3 - 0.0589X_4$ where: $Y_3$ = Finance		

Table 9. Multiple Regression: Finance along with the competencies

<b>(10a) Regression Statistics</b>		
Multiple R	0.9310	
R Square	0.8668	
Adjusted R Square	0.8516	
Observations, $n$	40	
<b>(10b)</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>p-Value</b>
Intercept	0.8204	0.5688
Creativity, $X_1$	-0.0855	0.8387
Entrepreneurial Quality, $X_2$	0.6626	0.1282
Social Consciousness, $X_3$	0.2353	0.2334
Ethics, $X_4$	-0.0238	0.9431
Regression Model: $Y_4 = 0.8204 - 0.0855X_1 + 0.6626X_2 + 0.2353X_3 + 0.0238X_4$ where: $Y_4$ = Enterprise Management		

Table 10. Multiple Regression: Enterprise Management along with the competencies

Business performance can be attributed to production, marketing, finance, and enterprise management. Tables 7 to 10 show the relationships between these attributes with creativity, entrepreneurial quality, social consciousness, and ethics. A strong effect exists between entrepreneurial quality and production (table 7); entrepreneurial quality and marketing (table 8); entrepreneurial quality and finance (table 9); and entrepreneurial quality and enterprise management (table 10). This result shows that the social entrepreneurs' level of entrepreneurial quality strongly relates to their production, marketing, finance, and enterprise management level. Moreover, a positive effect exists between creativity and production (0.168), while a negative effect exists between creativity and marketing (-0.147), creativity and finance (-0.184), and creativity and enterprise management (-0.086). There is also a positive effect between social consciousness and production (0.234), social consciousness and marketing (0.116), social consciousness and finance (0.205), and social consciousness and enterprise management (0.235). Lastly, a positive effect exists between ethics and production (0.064) and ethics and enterprise management (0.024), while negative effects exist between ethics and marketing (-0.125) and ethics and finance (-0.059). On the other hand, looking at the p-values in tables 7 to 10, only the entrepreneurial quality significantly impacted finance (table 9b).

Concerning social responsibility, table 11 shows a very high linear effect between entrepreneurial quality and social responsibility (1.524). A positive effect exists between ethics and social responsibility with a 0.410 coefficient, while a negative effect exists between creativity and social responsibility (- 1.177) and social consciousness and social responsibility (-0.087). Among the competencies, creativity and entrepreneurial quality showed below  $\alpha$  p-values at 0.0074 and 0.0009, respectively. Thus, creativity and entrepreneurial quality have a significant impact on social responsibility.

<b>(11a) Regression Statistics</b>		
Multiple R	0.7950	
R Square	0.6320	
Adjusted R Square	0.5990	
Observations, $n$	40	
<b>(11b)</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>p-Value</b>
Intercept	1.1580	0.4186
Creativity, $X_1$	-1.1771	0.0074
Entrepreneurial Quality, $X_2$	1.5241	0.0009
Social Consciousness, $X_3$	-0.0870	0.6542
Ethics, $X_4$	0.4098	0.2206
Regression Model: $Y_b = 1.1580 - 1.1771X_1 + 1.5241X_2 - 0.0870X_3 + 0.4098X_4$ where: $Y_b$ = Social Responsibility $X_1$ = Creativity $X_2$ = Entrepreneurial Quality $X_3$ = Social Consciousness $X_4$ = Ethics		

Table 11. Multiple Regression: Social Responsibility along with the competencies

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Top 5 Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Least 5 Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Mean Difference</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
<b>Social Entrepreneurial Competencies</b>	4.71	3.46	1.25	0.00
1. Creativity	4.62	2.54	2.08	0.00
2. Entrepreneurial Quality	4.74	2.60	2.14	0.00
3. Social Consciousness	4.70	3.98	0.72	0.00
4. Ethics	4.78	4.72	0.06	0.45
<i>The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)</i> <i>n = 40</i>				

Table 12. Significant differences in the level of competencies between top performing and least performing social enterprises

## **SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE LEVEL OF COMPETENCIES BETWEEN TOP PERFORMING AND LEAST PERFORMING SOCIAL ENTERPRISES**

Table 12 shows significant differences in the level of competencies between the five top performing social enterprises and the five least performing social enterprises associated with the rankings obtained.

Significant differences with creativity, entrepreneurial quality, and social consciousness show that the five top performers have a higher mean in creativity than the five least performers. In creativity, top performers have higher mean scores ( $MD = 2.08, p > 0.05$ ). They try very new and different things, encouraging people to find new ways of doing things, being clear about goals, and not being content with the present way of doing things. In entrepreneurial quality ( $MD = 2.14, p > 0.05$ ), seeking advice from other people, being comfortable about situations with uncontrollable outcomes, liking challenges and new opportunities, and believing that work is better than that of other people are the indicators that give top performers the advantage. For social consciousness ( $MD = 0.72, p > 0.05$ ), the indicators that the top performers have an advantage over least performers are seeking the support of others to solve or alleviate a social or an environmental problem, having a product that answers a social and/or environmental mission, making sure that products are free from defects and utilizing the mission as a basis for the selection of activities.

However, there is no significant difference between the five top performers and the five least performing social enterprises ( $MD = 0.06, p > 0.05$ ) under ethics. This result shows that the five top performers and the five least performers are similar in the level of ethics. This result can be related to the very high ratings of ethical indicators. Results show that the least performing enterprises perform significantly lower in creativity ( $MD = 2.08, p < 0.05$ ) and entrepreneurial quality ( $MD = 2.14, p < 0.05$ ). Relating this to the finding that the entrepreneurial quality influences business performance, least performers may improve this competency through improvements in production, marketing, finance, and enterprise management practices.

## CONCLUSION

Social entrepreneurs in the Bicol region obtained high-performance ratings that can be attributed to their high social responsibility and a medium rating in business performance. Least performing social enterprises perform significantly lower in business performance compared to top performing social enterprises. Specifically, least performing social enterprises perform significantly lower in the areas of adequacy and appropriateness of technology, ability to define quality standards and control, location of materials and production area being far from pollution, work area and tools are women-friendly, skilled and experienced leaders, meeting the volume required by the market, neat and attractive packaging, having a marketing study or plan, having established financial control, increases in annual sales, independence from grants, financial transparency, continuing a program to upgrade workers' skills, and having clear goals shared by all stakeholders.

Social enterprises obtained a high rating on the level of competencies. This high rating can be attributed to their average ratings on creativity and entrepreneurial quality and their very high ratings for social consciousness and ethics. Social entrepreneurs attained very high and high ratings on not quitting until getting things right, discontentment with the present way of doing things, looking for new solutions, exploring varied ways in their attempt to reach their goals, doing things that need to be done before being asked by others, spending a lot of time trying to find a solution, having a clear social and/or environmental mission, having a clear idea about beneficiaries, willingness to commit time, effort and resources, not tolerating discrimination, treating everyone equally, showing respect to business partners, and not committing any action to ruin trust. They also obtained average and low ratings on working with creative people, thinking about the future, being very clear about goals, seeking other people's advice, developing their work to be better, being comfortable about situations with uncontrollable outcomes, and monitoring and evaluation.

Moreover, entrepreneurial quality has a strong influence on business performance, particularly in finance. It also has a strong effect on social responsibility. Notably, the least performing social enterprises perform significantly lower in creativity and entrepreneurial quality. Hence, the least performing social enterprises may focus on improving their entrepreneurial quality level if they plan to improve their level of business performance.

Social enterprises in the Bicol region are more focused on achieving their environmental or social mission than their business performance. Several areas in business management need attention and improvement. Although it is good that social enterprises prioritize these missions, profit from business performance is necessary to secure the sustainability of social and environmental activities. Thus, social enterprises must evaluate the business aspect of the social enterprise and take action.

## PROSPECTS FOR BICOL SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS

The survey suggests that if social entrepreneurs in the Bicol region want to improve their entrepreneurial quality and business performance, they may start identifying their economic, social, or environmental goals based on their missions. Identifying these goals should involve the social entrepreneur and the members, partners, local community, and other stakeholders. These goals may serve as a guide in formulating the social enterprise's simple marketing plan and financial plan. The marketing plan may cover the product description, pricing, promotion, and distribution program, while the financial plan may cover financial control and procedure. They may also use basic strategic tools such as Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis to weigh their chances at success prior to decision-making. Social entrepreneurs may also encourage their members to contribute to the social enterprise's assets or capitalization and be transparent regarding financial situations.

However, due to limited financial resources, they may explore partnering with government agencies to share development costs. For example, they may consider a partnership with the Department of Trade and Industry, Department of Science and Technology, Department of Agriculture, Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, Non-Government Organizations, and state universities and colleges in improving their weak areas. Social enterprises may also partner with these agencies to prepare a program to develop the creativity among members and conduct training to improve workers' technical skills and improve the level of technology, particularly renewable technology. They may also partner with these agencies in learning about quality standards and control, in practicing financial management, and in strategic writing of plans.

Lastly, future research can be conducted on the possible influence of social consciousness and ethics on social entrepreneurs' business performance and the potential interventions to improve social entrepreneurs' level of entrepreneurial quality.

## REFERENCES

- Ademola, G. Olukotun, Samuel O. James, and Ifedolapo Olore. 2012. "The roles of record keeping in the survival and growth of small scale enterprises in Ijumu Local Government Area of Kogi State." *Global Journal of Management and Business Research* 12(13): 55-60.
- Al-Mamun, Abdullah, Noorshella Binti Che Nawi, and Noor Raihani Binti Zainol. 2016. "Entrepreneurial competencies and performance of informal micro-enterprises in Malaysia." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 7(3): 273-81.
- Aquino, Paolo Benigno "Bam." 2014. "S.B. 176: An act institutionalizing the Poverty Reduction through Social Entrepreneurship (PRESENT) program and promoting social enterprises with the poor as primary stakeholders." <http://legacy.senate.gov.ph/lisdata/2359820226!.pdf>.
- Aras, G., and David Crowther. 2008. "The social obligation of corporations." *Journal of Knowledge Globalization* 1(1): 43-59.
- Jackman, Lauren, ed. 2018. *Leading social entrepreneurs*. Arlington, VA: More Vang. <https://www.ashoka.org/en-us/files/ashoka2018-leading-social-entrepreneurs-booklet.pdf>.
- Asian Development Bank. 2017. "Are social enterprises the inclusive businesses of tomorrow? Development Bank's Perspective, Financed by the Government of Sweden and GIZ." Technical Assistant Consultant's Report. <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/project-documents/46240/46240-001-tacr-en.pdf>.
- Ballesteros, Marife, and Gilberto Llanto. 2017. "Strengthening social enterprises for inclusive growth: Philippines." Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <http://dirp3.pids.gov.ph/websitcms/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1704.pdf>.
- Boss, J. 2017. "Five reasons why goal setting will improve your focus." *Forbes*, January 19, 2017. Accessed February 14, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffboss/2017/01/19/5-reasons-why-goal-setting-will-improve-your-focus/#80f97f3534a0>.
- British Council. 2017. "Reaching the farthest first: The state of social enterprise in the Philippines." [https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/the\\_state\\_of\\_social\\_enterprise\\_in\\_the\\_philippines\\_british\\_council\\_singlepage\\_web.pdf](https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/the_state_of_social_enterprise_in_the_philippines_british_council_singlepage_web.pdf).

- Chandra, Yanto, Chris Styles, and Ian Wilkinson. 2009. "The recognition of first time international entrepreneurial opportunities: Evidence from firms in knowledge-based industries." *International Marketing Review* 26(1): 30–61. DOI:10.1108/02651330910933195.
- Craig, William. 2016. "5 benefits of hiring locally." *Forbes*, September 13, 2016. Accessed February 14, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/williamcraig/2016/09/13/5-benefits-of-hiring-locally/#637441704c1b>.
- Dacanay, Marie Lisa. 2012. "Social enterprises and the poor: Enhancing social entrepreneurship and stakeholder theory." PhD diss., Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. [http://research-api.cbs.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/58899306/Marie\\_Lisa\\_Dacanay.pdf](http://research-api.cbs.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/58899306/Marie_Lisa_Dacanay.pdf).
- Dacanay, Marie Lisa, and Eduardo A. Morato, eds. 2004. *Creating a space in the market: Social enterprise stories in Asia*. Makati, Philippines: Asian Institute of Management and Conference of Asian Foundations and Organizations.
- Darko, Emily, and Theresa Quijano. 2015. "A review of social enterprise activity in the Philippines, August 2015." British Council Philippines. Accessed May 1, 2018. [http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/social\\_enterprise\\_activity\\_philippines.pdf](http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/social_enterprise_activity_philippines.pdf).
- Deeb, George. 2015. "Should you quit your full time job for your startup?" *Forbes*, July 9, 2015. Accessed February 14, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/georgedeeb/2015/07/09/should-you-quit-your-full-time-job-for-your-startup/#337c89762861>.
- Drayton, William. 2002. "The citizen sector: Becoming as entrepreneurial and competitive as business." *California Management Review* 44(3): 120–32. <https://doi.org/10.2307%2F41166136>.
- Drennan, Jonathan. 2003. "Cognitive interviewing: Verbal data in the design and pretesting of questionnaires." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 42(1): 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02579.x>.
- Elkington, John. 1994. "Towards the sustainable corporation: Win-win-win business strategies for sustainable development." *California Management Review* 36(2): 99–100. <https://doi.org/10.2307%2F41165746>.
- Else, Wayne. 2017. "Five essential qualities for social enterprise success." *Forbes*, October 24, 2017. Accessed February 14, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinessdevelopmentcouncil/2017/10/24/five-essential-qualities-for-social-enterprise-success/?sh=342afdac3e16>.
- Faggian, Alessandra, and Philip McCann. 2019. "Human capital and regional development." *Handbook of regional growth and development theories*, edited by Roberta Capello and Peter Nijkamp, 149–71. Revised and extended 2nd edition. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gerlie Fabrizio, Paolo Gubitta, and Alessandra Tognazzo. 2011. "Entrepreneurial competencies and firm performance: An empirical study." VIII International Workshop on Human Resource Management – Seville, May 12–13, 2011, Conference Proceedings.

- Guclu, Ayse, J. Gregory Dees, and Beth Battle Anderson. 2002. "The process of social entrepreneurship: Creating opportunities worthy of serious pursuit." CASE Working Paper Series 3. [https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/02/Article\\_Deess\\_The-ProcessOfSocialEntrepreneurshipCreatingOppWorthyOfSeriousPursuit\\_2002.pdf](https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/02/Article_Deess_The-ProcessOfSocialEntrepreneurshipCreatingOppWorthyOfSeriousPursuit_2002.pdf).
- IESE Business School. 2015. "Four things we can learn from social entrepreneurs." *Forbes*, January 28, 2015. Accessed February 14, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/iese/2015/01/28/4-things-we-can-learn-from-social-entrepreneurs/#25c95ea72a57>.
- Institute for Social Entrepreneurship in Asia (ISEA). 2015. *Poverty reduction and women economic leadership: Roles, potentials and challenges of social enterprises in developing countries in Asia*. Asia: Institute for Social Entrepreneurship in Asia and Oxfam GB. [https://www.isea-group.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/ISEA\\_Oxfam\\_Poverty\\_Reduction\\_and\\_WEL\\_Report.pdf](https://www.isea-group.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/ISEA_Oxfam_Poverty_Reduction_and_WEL_Report.pdf).
- Kalyar, Masood Nawaz, Nosheen Rafi, and Awais Nawaz Kalyar. 2013. "Factors affecting corporate social responsibility: An empirical study." *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 30(4): 495-505. DOI: 10.1002/sres/2134.
- Khan, L. M., and R. Ahmed. 2012. "A comparative study of consumer perception and product quality: Chinese versus non-Chinese products." *Journal of PJETS* : 118-43.
- Lavinsky, Dave. 2013. "Marketing plan template: Exactly what to include." *Forbes*, September 30, 2013. Accessed February 14, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/davelavinsky/2013/09/30/marketing-plan-template-exactly-what-to-include/#5a5e38d35038>.
- Mitchelmore, Siwan, and Jennifer Rowley. 2013. "Entrepreneurial competencies of women entrepreneurs pursuing business growth." *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 20(1): 125-42.
- Narula, Prayag. 2017. "The for profit social enterprise is the impact model of the future." *Forbes*, December 22, 2017. Accessed February 14, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2017/12/22/the-forprofit-social-enterprise-is-the-impact-model-of-the-future/?sh=55a36ae25571>.
- National Economic Development Authority (NEDA). 2017. *Bicol Regional Development Plan 2017-2022*. Arimbay, Legazpi City. <http://nro5.neda.gov.ph>.
- Nicholls, Alex, ed. 2006. *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Osberg, Sally R., and Roger L. Martin. 2015. "Two keys to sustainable social enterprise." *Harvard Business Review* (May): 86-94.

Philippine Social Enterprise Network Incorporated (PhilSEN). 2009. "Towards developing social enterprise standards: Social enterprise quality index." Unpublished Report.

Salam, Shah Abdus, and Ainoon Naheer. 2014. "Research on poverty reduction and women economic leadership in Asia: Rules, potentials and challenges of social enterprises." ISEA Survey on Social Enterprises in Bangladesh: Final Report, 04-09-14. [https://dewbd.org/dew/images/Social\\_Enterprise\\_Study-Bangladesh-Final\\_Report.pdf](https://dewbd.org/dew/images/Social_Enterprise_Study-Bangladesh-Final_Report.pdf).

**CREZEL D. BARBONIO-OBREO** received her PhD in Business Administration from the Ateneo de Naga University and is currently the program coordinator for graduate business programs at the Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges. <barbonio.crezel@gmail.com>

**MARIA NINA CADANO-HOWARD** holds a PhD in Education Major in Educational Management at the University of Nueva Caceres. Presently, she is the chairperson for business management courses at the Ateneo de Naga University. <nenz1224@gmail.com>

**NINO MARTIN P. OBREO** has an MA in Entrepreneurship from Bicol University and is a faculty member of Bicol State College of Applied Sciences and Technology. He is currently taking his PhD in Commerce at the University of Sto. Tomas. <onin.obrero@gmail.com>