

# Micro, Small, and Medium Sized Enterprises' (MSMEs) Participation in Peacebuilding: Motivators and Barriers

Dr. Mark P. Doblás<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Laurence P. Bazan<sup>2</sup> and Tiburcio P. Ybanez<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, College of Financial and Administrative Sciences, AMA International University, KINGDOM OF BAHRAIN

<sup>2</sup>Dean, Criminology Department, Father Saturnino Urios University, PHILIPPINES

<sup>3</sup>Student, Criminology Department, Father Saturnino Urios University, PHILIPPINES

<sup>1</sup>Correspondence Author: [mpdoblás@amaui.edu.bh](mailto:mpdoblás@amaui.edu.bh)

## ABSTRACT

The academic literature has provided substantial amount of suggestions on broad concepts of business fostering peace in the community just by doing its operations properly. However, many could contend if these businesses could be urged to perform larger roles as agents for peace. Consequently, the desire to have businesses, particularly the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise (MSME), to act as key players in peacebuilding largely depends on the understanding of what could motivate them in acting such key role and what could possibly hinder them in doing the same. Thus, this study is an exploration of the motivators and challenges of MSMEs in acting as main agents for peacebuilding. The study utilized a descriptive research design involving thirty conveniently sampled MSMEs in Butuan City, Philippines. A researcher-made questionnaire was used as data gathering tool. A multivariate analysis was done to analyse the effect of participation and perceived risk in the identified motivators and barriers. The results of the study revealed that internal motivators are the greatest motivators in acting for peace. In addition, financial and political reasons are strong barriers for MSMEs to participate in peacebuilding. Finally, the study found that Level of Perceived Risk and Participation significantly affects the type of motivators and barriers MSMEs face in peacebuilding movements.

**Keywords--** Business for Peace, Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises, Perceived Risk, Peacebuilding Participation

## I. INTRODUCTION

The aim for peace and order is widely considered as universal among all economies. In fact, countries all over the world have invested heavily on military and policing to prevent violence and instability. The amount of resources incurred and the realization of the current practices' shortcomings has led to deliberate explorations for new alternatives. As Van Tulder and Van der Zwart (2014) observed, the globalized world has increased interconnectedness and interdependence requiring different issues to be addressed in a more integrated approach. Nevertheless, one very underutilized and unexplored asset

in the community for peace building is the private business sector (United State Institute of Peace, 2012). In fact, Nelson (2000) noted that there is relatively little scientific study conducted to explore how specifically the private sector, particularly local businesses and Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises, could directly participate in peace building.

While peacebuilding is an often a vague term, peacebuilding as perceived by this study is grounded on the works of Boutros-Ghali (1992) who defined peace-building as "the construct of tangible cooperative projects that link two or more parties to a mutually beneficial undertaking that not only contributes to economic and social development but also increases the trust that is so essential to peace". Thus, business peacebuilding properly conceived, should require that businesses play as main actors for peace and not just loosely participate in the initiative. Concrete efforts to maintain and promote peace, therefore, should be laid down by businesses themselves for the community where they operate.

Nevertheless, the academic literature has provided substantial amount of suggestions on broad concepts of business fostering peace in the community just by doing its operations properly. To cite some examples, business firms provide job opportunities thus allow economic growth that is material for creating peaceful communities. In addition, businesses acting as good corporate citizens also allow an espousing mechanism for community members to follow. As argued by Jackson and Coolican (2003), a sound way in doing business within the confines of the organizations will often result to facilitating a positive change outside and thus will allow a move towards a "peaceful world". However, the preceding practices of businesses in peace building are, in general, only incidental and are more often coping strategies to lessen the adverse impacts of conflicts among the private businesses. In other words, the participation is merely in passing as it is simply seen as a side effect of doing-no-harm to the community. While these activities are desirable, many have thought if these businesses could be urged to perform larger roles as agents for peace (UNGC, 2013). In other words, can businesses engage in activities that actively contribute to prevent conflict or conflict

settlement or even in conflict transformation or peacebuilding?

While various authors have argued that businesses has a natural desire for a peaceful world since it usually elicits an expanding market and greater profit (Barbara, 2006), it is usually contrasted by the surprisingly few examples of businesses actively contributing to conflict transformation and peace building (Joras, 2009). This inconsistency has probed researchers in exploring different themes of business working actively for peace. Needless to say, the complexity of the matter may be attributed to the fact that business in peace building and its literature are fairly young and limited and that it is an issue that is touched by broader disciplines like economics, political science, and sociology. However, as noted by Evers (2010), careful review of these literatures would reveal that there are six characteristics that summarize most of the findings in the area of business for peacebuilding. First, most works in business for peacebuilding only flourished around five years back. Second, anecdotes tend to dominate most of the studies showing the significance of business-based peacebuilding thus exhibiting the lack of systematic studies. Third, most of those that contribute in contemporary researchers are based on Non-government Organizations (NGOs) and Inter-government Organizations (IGOs). Fourth, most of the explored areas are based on the experiences of Multinational Companies (MNCs). Fifth, much of the researchers are normative. Finally, many of the aspects in the area are still unexplored especially those that look into the perspectives of local businesses or Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs).

Considering the instrumental role of local businesses and MSMEs in peacebuilding, it is imperative that this area should be explored. As Lederach(1997) argues that, “by definition, local businesses form part of the existing conflict context. In a sense, this relationship with the conflict is essential for local businesses to play an important role in building peace.” The role therefore of local and small medium enterprises in peacebuilding greatly lies in its linkages to different social and political actors.

The participation of the local businesses and MSEs, however, could not be fully defined if policy makers do not have the knowledge of what motivates and impedes them in participating in peacebuilding. As Kilic and others (2005) noted, the participation of local business and MSEs should start with the identification and analysis of their competencies, interest, motivators, and impediments for participation in peace building. Thus, this study aims to look at the last two variables of concern. This research will assess the motivators and barriers for peacebuilding among local MSMEs in the City of Butuan, Philippines. The findings of the study will serve as baseline for further activities and policy identification and implementation pertaining to business in peacebuilding initiatives.

## II. FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

This study is anchored on the three-tier understanding of the peacebuilding potential of societies developed by Lederach’s (1997). In addition, the works of Nelson (2000) and Joras (2009) on incentives for business-based peacebuilding and barriers, respectively, was utilized as guiding principles to which the assessment and analysis of this inquiry was based.

The Lederach’s (1997) model shows the wide ‘networked’ position held by the private sectors in society. The model also compares the participants of the actors from the civic group and the private firms. As what can be seen in Figure 1, SMEs and local business, including informal grassroots enterprises, have a deep-seated influence on conflict settlement. The acknowledgement of the Local Businesses and SMEs influence in terms of local political leverage through variety of linkages with different actors and strands using business relations with staff and business partners is greatly highlighted by the said model. Considering also those MSMEs are operating directly with the public, the model also provides a framework that stresses how MSMEs can influence societies through cultural, ethnic, and religious channels.

### Local Actors in Conflict Prevention and Resolution



Figure 1 Three-tier understanding of the peacebuilding potential of societies by Lederach's (1997)

#### **Motivations for Participation in Peacebuilding**

In terms of motivation, Nelson (2006) noted that external factors especially the progresses in humanitarian and human rights law and the growth undertakings of non-government pressure groups, social media and internet, has amplified the desire of private firms in complicity in situations leading to conflict. These external factors have forced private companies to be more mindful of their participation in peacebuilding. Examples of these external factors include Privatisation and Liberalisation. Increased emerging markets and the lessening of the ownership of governments has both increased the power of private sectors and the consumers who demands better behaviours from businesses. Also, technology has increased transparency allowing the consumers to easily view the activities of corporations and businesses. Increased competitiveness and expectations has also led to changes in corporate governance structures that influenced how business should behave in a more socially conscious way.

In addition, several company specific interests were also found to have a convoluting force in providing motivations for participation in peacebuilding. This internal factor has provided businesses additional incentives to participate in peacebuilding. Rotenberg (2004) found that the private sector's costs of conflict are important motivator for business to participate in peace building. Deitelhoff and Wolf (2010) also found that a company's development of internal moral standards and values serves as motivator to contribute in peace and security. Private company's need for material information to hedge against risk was also

found by Switzer and Barbara (2006) as a specific incentive for firms to participate activities pertaining to security and order. Finally, building brand image as motivator was also observed in countries as revealed by the works of Haufler (2006). Participation in peacebuilding is therefore a tool for brand image building.

#### **Barriers of Participation in Peacebuilding**

Although non-government organizations (NGOs) as well as governmental actors' barriers in peace keeping are well documented, very few research has looked into the private sectors' constraints in participating in such program. Joras (2009) provided a theoretical underpinning for the empirical analysis on various factors that inhibit private sectors in directly participating in the peacebuilding process. The factors can be categorized in three typologies; Financial, Political, and Awareness and Capacity Barriers.

The works of Feil and others (2008) has highlighted that financial reasons or cost is frequently suggested as the main reason why private sectors should heavily invest in taking on peace promoting initiatives. However, it is also often the case that financial constraints hinder the organization is purposeful engagement in peacebuilding. As Berman (2000) noticed, the geographic spread, in the effect of conflicts may differ depending on several factors. The individual costs of conflict may either be too low compared to the expense of hiring individual company security or too high to act upon as a primary actor. Whichever the case, financial balancing tends to play a role in deciding to engage actively in peacebuilding.

In addition, political factors tend to also hinder the businesses to participate in peacebuilding processes. As Banfield and others (2006) explained, companies often feel that they should stay neutral and thus should shy away from national politics to avoid being accused of using their economic power to manipulate political decisions. Moreover, private firms may realize that their business is highly dependent in the general services of the government and that they avoid alienating in something that they believe as a government concern.

Finally, the novelty of the concept of business for peacebuilding may be a reason for the lack of awareness and capacity of the private firms to move as a whole for peace building. Companies may even consider it too complex that the lack of information, best practices or bases for business supporting peacebuilding may hinder the motivation to participate. The study of Collaborative Learning Projects (2003) has revealed that in the circumstance of intense conflict, the absence of the capacity of the organization or lack thereof may in fact be a result of the conflict itself as the presence of disorder has made the business groups non-functional anymore.

#### ***Factors Affecting Motivators and Barriers in Peacebuilding Participation***

Businesses do not directly contribute to peace and security thru maintaining order. Instead, they spend their resources on indirect assistances like fighting corruption and other social programs thru its Corporate Social Responsibility (Deitelhoff and Wolf, 2010). However, the likelihood of such participation on such is affected by several factors such as proximity and perceived exposure to conflict and company characteristics which include level of engagement to peacebuilding in society.

### **III. OBJECTIVES**

The study is aimed at identifying the motivators and barriers for local MSMEs in Butuan City, Philippines in peacebuilding activities/initiatives. Specifically, it was conducted to achieve the following objectives;

1. Identify the profile of the MSMEs in Butuan City, Philippines in terms of type of business, longevity of operation, highest educational attainment of owner, and average monthly income, perceived distance and exposure from conflict area, and the frequency and level of participation in peacebuilding activities.

2. Identify the motivators and barriers for peacebuilding of the local MSMEs in Butuan City, Philippines.
3. Assess if perceived risk and participation in peacebuilding has a significant effect of in motivators and barriers in peacebuilding participation.

### **IV. METHODOLOGY**

The study employed a descriptive research design. The study used a researcher-made questionnaire of three parts. The first part determined the profile of the respondents in terms of type of business, longevity of operation, highest educational attainment of owner, and average monthly income. Peacebuilding characteristics were also taken in part one which includes perceived distance and exposure from conflict area and the level of participation in peacebuilding activities.

The second part of the instrument is in a 4 point Likert Scale consisting of 10 items with the first 5 covering the internal motivators and the next 5 inclusive of the external motivators for peacebuilding as identified by Nelson (2006). Finally, the third parts consist of 9 items, also in 4 point Likert Scale, covering 3 items each for Financial, Political, and Awareness and Capacity barriers respectively. These indicators, as discussed in the previous section, were based on the works of Joras (2009). Prior to the distribution of the questionnaire, a pilot test was conducted to 15 non-participating local businesses and the consequent data yielded a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.88 indicating high internal consistency.

The questionnaire was administered to the local Micro, Small, Medium Entrepreneurs in the City of Butuan, Philippines during the period covering September 26, 2018 to October 3 of the same year. Convenience sampling was utilized considering the availability of the respondents. A total of 30 respondents were part of the final sample for the study.

The profile of the respondents was treated using descriptive statistics. In addition, the motivators and barriers assessed were treated using weighted mean. Finally, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to test the differences in the identified motivators and barriers considering perceived risk and level of involvement in peacebuilding activity.

### **V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Profile of the Respondents**

Table 1

Profile of Respondents	F	%
<i>Type of Business</i>		
Retail/Merchandising	14	44.67
Service	10	33.33
Manufacturing	6	20.00
<i>Number of Years in Operation</i>		
Less than 5 Years	13	43.33
5-10 years	10	33.33
More than 10 Years	7	23.33
<i>Owner's Highest Educational Attainment</i>		
Elementary/Highschool Graduate	2	6.67
College Level/Graduate	8	26.67
Some Post Graduate	20	66.67
<i>Average Monthly Income</i>		
₱10,000 and below	5	16.67
₱10,001-₱25,000	9	30.00
₱25,001-₱35,000	7	23.33
₱35,001-₱45,000	7	23.33
Above ₱45,000	2	6.67
<i>Perceived Proximity to Conflict Area</i>		
Extremely Near	2	6.67
Near	24	80.00
Far	2	6.67
Extremely Far	2	6.67
<i>Perceived likelihood of affected by conflicts/war</i>		
Very Likely	5	16.67
Likely	13	43.33
Unlikely	7	23.33
Very Unlikely	5	16.67
<i>Degree of direct Participation in Peace Building</i>		
Very Active	8	26.67
Active	5	16.67
Moderately Active	17	56.67

Table 1 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of type of business, number of years in operations, Owner's Highest Educational Attainment, Average Monthly Income, Perceived Proximity to Conflict Area, Perceived likelihood of affected by conflicts/war, and Degree of direct Participation in Peace Building. As what can be gleaned from the table, are engaged in Retail/Merchandising and Service related operation with 44.67% ( $n=14$ ) and 33.33% ( $n=10$ ), respectively. This is not surprising since majority (23.21%) of the MSMEs in the Philippines are engaged in Wholesale and Retail (Aldaba, 2012).

In terms of number of years in operation, majority of the respondents have only been operation for less than 5 years ( $n=13$ , 43.33%) while only 23.33% ( $n=7$ ) have been operations for more than 10 years suggesting that most of

the SMEs in research locale are relatively new. In addition, majority of the business owners have are highly educated with 66.67% ( $n=20$ ) having some form of post graduate education while only 2 (6.67%) are either elementary or at high school level.

As to average monthly income, majority of the respondents are P 10,001-P 25,000 a month ( $n=9$ , 30%) while only 6.67% ( $n=2$ ) are earning above P 45,000 per month. Moreover, the same table also shows the distribution of respondents in terms of other Peace related information. As what can be gleaned from the table, majority at 80% ( $n=24$ ) of the respondents believe that they are near conflict areas and perceives that they are likely ( $n=13$ , 43.33%) to be affected by conflicts/war.

Finally, as to level of participation in peacebuilding activity, more than half of the respondents

(n=17, 56.67%) consider themselves moderately active, while only 26.67% (n=8) consider their level of participation as “active”. This reinforces the observation of

Joras (2009) showing that there are very little documented cases of businesses actively participating in peacebuilding.

**Motivators for Participating in Peacebuilding**

*Table 2*  
MSMEs External Motivators for Participating in Peacebuilding

Indicators	Mean	Stdev	Description
<i>External Motivators</i>			
Privatization increases my desire to exercise my influence towards peace building.	1.27	0.45	Very Low Motivator
New markets/customers demand our participation in peace building.	1.77	0.43	Low Motivator
Transparency, as caused by technology, encourages my business to be more actively engaged in peace building	2.10	0.31	Low Motivator
Increased societal expectations, NGOs and the public in general increasingly demand that businesses be held accountable for peace building	2.17	0.38	Low Motivator
New trends in business governance convinced me to participate in peace building	2.27	0.45	Low Motivator
<b>Over-all</b>	<b>1.91</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>Low Motivator</b>

Table 2 shows the external motivators of MSMEs in directly participating in peacebuilding processes. As the table shows, the over-all influence of external motivators to motivate MSMEs is low with a mean of 1.91 and a standard deviation of 0.40. This would suggest that MSMEs are not that motivated by external factors in participating in peacebuilding.

In fact, privatization has not increased their desire to exercise their influence towards peace building (Statement No.1) and that even market demands has not motivated them in participating in peacebuilding activities (Statement No.2). Moreover, even the transparency, brought about by technology, does not encourage them to

be more actively engaged in peace building(Statement No.3). Even business trends and the demand from the society have not moved them to be directly involved in peacebuilding.

The findings suggest a different observation from the works of Haufler(2006) showing that external factors especially the change in the landscape of politics has allowed businesses to be main actors, if not enforcers of new norms in peacebuilding. These findings may suggest that MSMEs find external factors, like privatization, technology, and the like, to be irrelevant in their decision to participate in peacebuilding.

*Table 3*  
MSMEs Internal Motivators for Participating in Peacebuilding

Indicators	Mean	Stdev	Description
<i>Internal Motivators</i>			
The need for security motivates me to participate in peace building.	3.77	0.50	Very High Motivator
The possible financial loss caused by conflict and war is a good motivator to participate in peace building	3.63	0.49	Very High Motivator
The need for material information regarding possible conflicts that may disrupt my business is a good reason to join in peace building initiatives.	2.20	1.16	Low Motivator
It is part of my business value that I should participate in peace building.	3.30	0.88	Very High Motivator
Peace building participation is influenced by my business’ need for good brand image.	3.43	0.82	Very High Motivator
<b>Over-all</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>Very High Motivator</b>

On the other hand, internal motivators tend to provide a different observation as shown in table 3. The over-all mean resulted to 3.27 ( $SD=0.77$ ) indicating that internal factors such as cost savings and other business based factors being very high motivators in participating in peacebuilding.

Indeed, the need for security (Statement No. 1) and the fear of potential loss caused by conflict and war (Statement No.2) serve as the major motivators for the respondents to initiate peacebuilding activities. In addition, peacebuilding participation tends to be influenced by the business' need for good brand image (Statement No.5). However, among the internal motivators identified, acquisition of material information (Statement No.3) tends

to be low in motivating MSMEs in peacebuilding participation.

The findings support the study of Feil and others(2008) stating that cost motivations tend to be the central reason for participating in peacebuilding initiatives. The need to create an environment that would allow businesses to gain economically is central to all peace initiatives. Internal or business based factors tend to motivate MSMEs more than outside factors. The need to self-sustain the business operation and to survive economically is much more viable reason to engage in peacebuilding than markets, regulations and socio-political motives.

**Barriers in Participating in Peacebuilding**

Table 4

Financial Barriers

Indicators	Mean	Stdev	Description
Participations in peace building is very costly	3.77	0.43	Very Strong
It requires substantial amount of resources to participate in peace building activity	3.87	0.35	Very Strong
My business does not possess the necessary financial ability to be involved in peace building programs.	3.90	0.31	Very Strong
<b>Over-all</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>Very Strong</b>

In terms of the barriers to participate, table 4 shows the financial factors that impede the respondents in engaging into peacebuilding. As what can be gleaned from the table, the over-all result showed that financial factors tend to be a very strong barrier in hindering MSMEs in to actively participate in the peacebuilding process ( $x=3.84$ ,  $SD=0.36$ ). The small standard deviation value also suggests that the respondents tend to agree on this matter.

In fact, the respondents agree that participation in peacebuilding tend to be very costly (Statement No.1) and that their business does not possess the necessary financial capability to be involved in peace building programs

(Statement No.3). The respondents feel that actively participating in the peacebuilding process requires substantial amount of resources (Statement No.2).

This would support the findings of Berman (2000) stating that the cost of participation in peacebuilding requires balancing as private sectors tend to see it as a costly activity despite the fact that the cost of the effect of non-participation is also high. Considering the characteristics of MSMEs to be economically small, the impact of such participation in their financial standing tends to outweigh the benefits of participating in peacebuilding.

Table 5

Political Barriers

Indicators	Mean	Stdev	Description
It is the job of government, not businesses, to maintain peace and order.	3.83	0.38	Very Strong
Involving my business in peace related issues might result to conflict with government policies.	3.87	0.35	Very Strong
Business participation in peace policies and activities might cause allegations of political bias.	3.50	0.51	Very Strong
<b>Over-all</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>Very Strong</b>

In terms of political barriers, table 5 shows the political factors that may impede them to actively participating in peacebuilding. As what can be gleaned

from the table, political barriers tend to be a very strong barrier ( $x=3.73$ ,  $SD=0.41$ ) in participating in peacebuilding.

As a matter of fact, the respondents believe that involving their business in peace related issues might result to conflict with government policies (Statement No.2) and that it is not the responsibility of business to start programs that maintain peace and order (Statement No.1). Consequently, the respondents believe that business participation in peace policies and activities might cause allegations of political bias (statement No.3).

Similarly, Banfield and others (2006) explained how companies often feel that they should stay neutral so as to avoid being unduly accused of using their economic influence to affect issues of the state. The findings show how hesitations may arise due to often unfortunate social view of the excessive isolation of private firms from the activities viewed as exclusively for the state like peace and order.

*Table 6*  
Barriers in terms of Awareness and Capacity

Indicators	Mean	Stdev	Description
I am not certain how my business can participate in peace building.	1.83	0.70	Weak
I am not aware of the practices that could help in peace building.	1.97	0.72	Weak
My business does not possess the ability to organize a peace building initiatives.	1.63	0.85	Very Weak
<b>Over-all</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>Weak</b>

Table 6 shows the respondents barriers in terms of Awareness and Capacity. As what the table shows, the over-all result resulted to a mean of 1.81 ( $SD=0.76$ ) indicating that awareness and capacity are weak barriers of participation of MSMEs in peacebuilding process.

The results showed that the MSMEs in Butuan are in capable of organizing itself to create peace building activities (Statement No.3) and that they are certain on how they could participate in the peace building process (Statement No.1). Finally, they are aware of the practices that could help in peacebuilding (Statement No.2). The results in each of the indicator greatly suggest that current awareness and capacity to organize are not impediments for

MSMEs in initiating peace building efforts in the community.

The findings goes in direct opposite of the observation documented by Rettberge (2004) suggesting that the over-all weakness of the organizational structures of the private sector contributes to their inability to organize and thus making it difficult to act in unison to combat conflict as a group. The novelty of business for peace has also made it difficult for businesses to initiate drives against conflict and violence as added by the report of Collaborative Learning Projects (2003). The MSMEs in Butuan showed that they are in fact organized to initiate peace projects and that they are aware of their respective roles in such activity.

***Effect of Perceived Risk and Level of Participation to Motivators in Peacebuilding Participation***

*Table 7*  
Multivariate Analysis for Perceived Risk vis a vis Motivators

Effect	Value	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.998	7071.941 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.998
	Wilks' Lambda	.002	7071.941 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.998
	Hotelling's Trace	565.755	7071.941 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.998
	Roy's Largest Root	565.755	7071.941 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.998
Perceived Risk	Pillai's Trace	1.296	15.969	.000	.648
	Wilks' Lambda	.077	21.751 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.723
	Hotelling's Trace	7.170	28.680	.000	.782
	Roy's Largest Root	6.411	55.566 <sup>c</sup>	.000	.865

*a. Design: Intercept + Perceived Risk*

*b. Exact statistic*

*c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.*



Table 7 shows the Multivariate Analysis for Perceived Risk vis a vis Motivators. The one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for Perceived Risk, Wilks'  $\lambda = 0.077$ ,  $F = 21.751$ ,  $p < .001$ ,

partial eta squared = 0.723. Thus Perceived Risk has an effect to the MSMEs motivators in engaging into activities in peacebuilding. Level of perceived risk explains around 72% of the variation in Motivators.

Table 8  
Significant Univariate Effect for Perceived Risk vis a vis Motivators

Dependent Variable	Perceived Risk	Perceived Risk	Mean		Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
			Difference	Std. Error		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
External Motivator	Likely	Unlikely	-.2352*	.06846	.002	-.3759	-.0945
		Very Likely	-.0923	.07684	.240	-.2503	.0656
		Very Unlikely	-.8123*	.07684	.000	-.9703	-.6544
	Unlikely	Likely	.2352*	.06846	.002	.0945	.3759
		Very Likely	.1429	.08550	.107	-.0329	.3186
		Very Unlikely	-.5771*	.08550	.000	-.7529	-.4014
	Very Likely	Likely	.0923	.07684	.240	-.0656	.2503
		Unlikely	-.1429	.08550	.107	-.3186	.0329
		Very Unlikely	-.7200*	.09235	.000	-.9098	-.5302
	Very Unlikely	Likely	.8123*	.07684	.000	.6544	.9703
		Unlikely	.5771*	.08550	.000	.4014	.7529
		Very Likely	.7200*	.09235	.000	.5302	.9098
Internal Motivator	Likely	Unlikely	.5824*	.11210	.000	.3520	.8128
		Very Likely	.7538*	.12583	.000	.4952	1.0125
		Very Unlikely	1.3538*	.12583	.000	1.0952	1.6125
	Unlikely	Likely	-.5824*	.11210	.000	-.8128	-.3520
		Very Likely	.1714	.14001	.232	-.1164	.4592
		Very Unlikely	.7714*	.14001	.000	.4836	1.0592
	Very Likely	Likely	-.7538*	.12583	.000	-1.0125	-.4952
		Unlikely	-.1714	.14001	.232	-.4592	.1164
		Very Unlikely	.6000*	.15123	.001	.2891	.9109
	Very Unlikely	Likely	-1.3538*	.12583	.000	-1.6125	-1.0952
		Unlikely	-.7714*	.14001	.000	-1.0592	-.4836
		Very Likely	-.6000*	.15123	.001	-.9109	-.2891

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = .057.

\*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Given the significance of the overall test, a pairwise analysis was done to the motivators after considering perceived risk. As table 8 shows, there is a significant difference in motivators with those having higher perceived risk being more motivated by external motivators while those who have lower level of perceived risk finds internal factors more motivating.

This would suggest that those MSMEs who do not feel that they are likely to be affected by conflict are only driven by business based reasons such as lowering down cost and business image. On the other hand, MSMEs who feel that they are susceptible to conflict tend to being moved by market factors, social influence and the like.

Table 9  
Multivariate Analysis for Level of Participation vis a vis Motivators

Effect		Value	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.997	4741.941 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.997
	Wilks' Lambda	.003	4741.941 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.997

	Hotelling's Trace	364.765	4741.941 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.997
	Roy's Largest Root	364.765	4741.941 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.997
LevelofParticipation	Pillai's Trace	.746	8.032	.000	.373
	Wilks' Lambda	.262	12.395 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.488
	Hotelling's Trace	2.785	17.406	.000	.582
	Roy's Largest Root	2.774	37.446 <sup>c</sup>	.000	.735

a. Design: Intercept + LevelofParticipation

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Table 9 shows the one-way MANOVA statistics for the effect of level of participation to Motivators. As what can be gleaned from the table, there is a significant multivariate main effect for Level of Participation to

Motivating factors in peacebuilding, Wilks'  $\lambda = 0.262$ ,  $F = 12.395$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta squared = 0.488. Participation explains 48.8% of the variation in Motivators.

Table 10

Significant Multivariate Effect for Level of Participation vis a vis Motivators

Dependent Variable	Level of Participation	Level of Participation	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
External Motivator	Active	Not Active	.7200*	.09848	.000	.5179	.9221
		Very Active	.7318*	.08788	.000	.5514	.9121
	Not Active	Active	-.7200*	.09848	.000	-.9221	-.5179
		Very Active	.0118	.07406	.875	-.1402	.1637
Internal Motivator	Active	Not Active	-.7318*	.08788	.000	-.9121	-.5514
		Not Active	-.0118	.07406	.875	-.1637	.1402
	Not Active	Active	.9750*	.22459	.000	.5142	1.4358
		Very Active	-.0956	.16890	.576	-.4422	.2510
Very Active	Active	1.0706*	.20042	.000	.6594	1.4818	
	Not Active	.0956	.16890	.576	-.2510	.4422	

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = .155.

\*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The pairwise analysis results are shown in Table 10. As the table indicates, MSMEs who consider themselves active has a significantly higher internal and external motivators relative to the non-active MSMEs with differences having  $p$  values lesser than 0.05 for both

motivators. This would suggest that active MSMEs are most likely be convinced to participate in peacebuilding if proper business based and socio-political reasons are met or present.

**Effect of Perceived Risk and Level of Participation to Barriers in Peacebuilding Participation**

Table 11

Multivariate Analysis for Perceived Risk vis a vis Barriers

Effect		Value	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.999	6136.719 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.999
	Wilks' Lambda	.001	6136.719 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.999
	Hotelling's Trace	767.090	6136.719 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.999

	Roy's Largest Root	767.090	6136.719 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.999
Perceived Risk	Pillai's Trace	1.472	8.354	.000	.491
	Wilks' Lambda	.071	12.782	.000	.586
	Hotelling's Trace	5.571	14.031	.000	.650
	Roy's Largest Root	3.446	29.869 <sup>c</sup>	.000	.775

a. Design: Intercept + Perceived Risk

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Table 11 shows the Multivariate Analysis for Perceived Risk vis a vis Barriers to Participation in Peacebuilding. The one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for Perceived Risk, Wilks'  $\lambda = 0.071$ ,  $F = 12.782$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta squared =

0.586. Thus Perceived Risk has an effect to the barriers of MSMEs to participate in peacebuilding. Level of perceived risk explains around 58% of the variation in Barriers in Participation.

Table 12  
Significant Multivariate Effect for Perceived Risk vis a vis Barriers

Dependent Variable	Perceived Risk	Perceived Risk	Mean			95% Confidence Interval	
			Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Financial Barrier	Likely	Unlikely	.2381*	.07649	.004	.0809	.3953
		Very Likely	.0000	.08586	1.000	-.1765	.1765
		Very Unlikely	.6000*	.08586	.000	.4235	.7765
	Unlikely	Likely	-.2381*	.07649	.004	-.3953	-.0809
		Very Likely	-.2381*	.09553	.019	-.4345	-.0417
		Very Unlikely	.3619*	.09553	.001	.1655	.5583
	Very Likely	Likely	.0000	.08586	1.000	-.1765	.1765
		Unlikely	.2381*	.09553	.019	.0417	.4345
		Very Unlikely	.6000*	.10318	.000	.3879	.8121
	Very Unlikely	Likely	-.6000*	.08586	.000	-.7765	-.4235
		Unlikely	-.3619*	.09553	.001	-.5583	-.1655
		Very Likely	-.6000*	.10318	.000	-.8121	-.3879
Political Barrier	Likely	Unlikely	-.0037	.14809	.980	-.3081	.3007
		Very Likely	-.3846*	.16623	.029	-.7263	-.0429
		Very Unlikely	-.3179	.16623	.067	-.6596	.0237
	Unlikely	Likely	.0037	.14809	.980	-.3007	.3081
		Very Likely	-.3810*	.18496	.050	-.7612	-.0008
		Very Unlikely	-.3143	.18496	.101	-.6945	.0659
	Very Likely	Likely	.3846*	.16623	.029	.0429	.7263
		Unlikely	.3810*	.18496	.050	.0008	.7612
		Very Unlikely	.0667	.19978	.741	-.3440	.4773
	Very Unlikely	Likely	.3179	.16623	.067	-.0237	.6596
		Unlikely	.3143	.18496	.101	-.0659	.6945
		Very Likely	-.0667	.19978	.741	-.4773	.3440
Awareness and Capacity	Likely	Unlikely	.0403	.14532	.784	-.2584	.3390
		Very Likely	-1.4359*	.16312	.000	-1.7712	-1.1006
		Very Unlikely	-.1026	.16312	.535	-.4379	.2327
	Unlikely	Likely	-.0403	.14532	.784	-.3390	.2584
		Very Likely	-1.4762*	.18150	.000	-1.8493	-1.1031
		Very Unlikely	-.1429	.18150	.438	-.5159	.2302
Very Likely	Likely	1.4359*	.16312	.000	1.1006	1.7712	

	Unlikely	1.4762*	.18150	.000	1.1031	1.8493
	Very Unlikely	1.3333*	.19604	.000	.9304	1.7363
Very Unlikely	Likely	.1026	.16312	.535	-.2327	.4379
	Unlikely	.1429	.18150	.438	-.2302	.5159
	Very Likely	-1.3333*	.19604	.000	-1.7363	-.9304

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = .096.

\*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Given the significance of the overall test, a pairwise analysis was done to the identified barriers after considering perceived risk. As table 12 shows, there is a significant difference in barriers with those MSMEs having

higher perceived risk seeing political barrier as more impeding than financial constraint and awareness and capacity.

Table 13  
Multivariate Analysis for Level of Participation vis a vis Barriers

Effect		Value	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.999	5662.982 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.999
	Wilks' Lambda	.001	5662.982 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.999
	Hotelling's Trace	679.558	5662.982 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.999
	Roy's Largest Root	679.558	5662.982 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.999
Level of Participation	Pillai's Trace	1.350	17.985	.000	.675
	Wilks' Lambda	.092	19.123 <sup>b</sup>	.000	.696
	Hotelling's Trace	5.060	20.240	.000	.717
	Roy's Largest Root	3.797	32.907 <sup>c</sup>	.000	.792

a. Design: Intercept + Level of Participation

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Table 13 shows the one-way MANOVA statistics for the effect of level of participation to Barriers. As what can be gleaned from the table, there is a significant multivariate main effect for Level of Participation to

Barriers in peacebuilding participation, Wilks'  $\lambda = 0.092$ ,  $F = 19.123$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta squared = 0.696. Participation explains 69.6% of the variation in Barriers for peacebuilding participation.

Table 14  
Significant Multivariate Effect for Level of Participation vis a vis Barriers

Dependent Variable	Level of Participation	Level of Participation	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Financial Barrier	Active	Not Active	-.6000*	.10555	.000	-.8166	-.3834
		Very Active	-.5020*	.09419	.000	-.6952	-.3087
	Not Active	Active	.6000*	.10555	.000	.3834	.8166
		Very Active	.0980	.07938	.227	-.0648	.2609
Political Barrier	Active	Not Active	-.0667	.15807	.677	-.3910	.2577
		Very Active	.3843*	.14106	.011	.0949	.6738
	Not Active	Active	.0667	.15807	.677	-.2577	.3910

		Very Active	.4510*	.11888	.001	.2071	.6949
	Very Active	Active	-.3843*	.14106	.011	-.6738	-.0949
		Not Active	-.4510*	.11888	.001	-.6949	-.2071
Awareness and Capacity	Active	Not Active	-1.0000*	.18605	.000	-1.3818	-.6182
		Very Active	.2157	.16604	.205	-.1250	.5564
	Not Active	Active	1.0000*	.18605	.000	.6182	1.3818
		Very Active	1.2157*	.13993	.000	.9286	1.5028
	Very Active	Active	-.2157	.16604	.205	-.5564	.1250
		Not Active	-1.2157*	.13993	.000	-1.5028	-.9286

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = .107.

\*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The pairwise analysis was carried on as the difference was found to be significant in which results are shown in Table 14. As the table indicates, MSMEs who consider themselves active has significantly found themselves hindered by all identified barriers relative to non-active MSMEs having  $p$  values lesser than 0.05 for both motivators. This would suggest that active MSMEs are see the peacebuilding as a financially, politically, and structurally difficult endeavour.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be derived that MSMEs in Butuan City Philippines are mostly engaged in Retail and Merchandising and are relatively new in the business. In addition, MSMEs in the study locale believe that they are near to areas of conflict and that they are susceptible to the impacts of such conflict. Moreover, a great proportion MSMEs are generally active in participating in peacebuilding activities.

The study also found that internal motivators such as cost (due to conflict) avoidance, brand/business image and other business based motivators are greater than socio-political motivators. This suggests that MSMEs in Butuan City will most likely participate in peacebuilding due to business related results. Moreover, financial and political reasons will most likely impede MSMEs to participate in peacebuilding. Awareness and Capacity to organize is not an issue for peacebuilding initiatives among MSMEs in Butuan City.

Finally, the study found that Level of Perceived Risk and Participation significantly affects the type of motivators and barriers an MSMEs faces in peacebuilding movements. The study also concludes that MSMEs that are vastly aware of the perils of conflict tends to consider peacebuilding as a social responsibility and not just a business agenda. In addition, participation in peace related activities stimulates MSMEs motivation in creating initiatives against conflict. Moreover, political impediments tend to exacerbate the perceived risk that MSMEs face in

peacebuilding initiation. Finally, it was found that while increased participation in peace related activities can stimulate noble motivations, it also increases the perceived difficulties of MSMEs in creating businesses for peacebuilding.

With this, the results suggest that policies and programs to encourage the private sector, especially the MSMEs should not only be inclusive but more importantly should reinforce or establish two very important points. First, political cooperation and liberalization. MSMEs should feel that business for peacebuilding is not invasive to the government's agenda and that actively initiating it will not tarnish their relationship with the government. Secondly, policies and programs should not only make MSMEs aware of the perils and negative effects of conflict to their business but reassures them that they will be supported both in the financial and technical aspects of things and that they can do such in an environment that does not wrongfully accuse them of political bias.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Aldaba, R. (2012). SMEs in the Philippine manufacturing industry and globalization: Meeting the development challenges. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*. Series No.5. Available at: [http://www.eria.org/SMEs%20in%20the%20Philippine%20Manufacturing%20Industry%20and%20Globalization%20Meeting\\_the%20Development%20Challenges.pdf](http://www.eria.org/SMEs%20in%20the%20Philippine%20Manufacturing%20Industry%20and%20Globalization%20Meeting_the%20Development%20Challenges.pdf).
- [2] Banfield, J., Gündüz, C., & Killik, N. (2006). *Local business, local peace: The peacebuilding potential of the domestic private sector*. London: International Alert.
- [3] Barbara, J. (2006). Nation building and the role of the private sector as a political peace-builder. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 6(4), 581-594.
- [4] Berman, J. (2000). Boardrooms and bombs: Strategies of multinational corporations in conflict areas. *Harvard International Review*, XXII(3), 28-32.
- [5] Boutros-Ghali & Boutros. (1992). An agenda for peace. preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and

peacekeeping. *Report of the Secretary General*. Available at: <http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html>. Accessed on: 09.08.2018

[6] Collaborative Learning Projects. (2003). The role of business in conflict resolution and peace building. *Issue Paper*. Available at:

<http://live-cdacollaborative.pantheonsite.io/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/The-Role-of-Business-in-Conflict-Resolution-and-Peace-Building.pdf>.

Accessed on: 08/27/2018.

[7] Deitelhoff, N. & Wolf, KD. (2010). *Corporate security responsibility?*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[8] Feil, M., Haidvogel, S., & Andreas, E. (2008). Bad guys, good guys, or something in between? *Corporate Governance Contributions in Zones of Violent Conflict*. Available at:

<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/71728224.pdf>.

[9] Evers, T. (2010). Doing business and making peace?. *Swedish Institute of International Affairs, 3*. Available at: <https://www.ui.se/globalassets/ui.se-eng/publications/ui-publications/doing-business-and-making-peace-min.pdf>.

Accessed on: 08/27/18

[10] Haufler, V. (2006). *Foreign investors in conflict zones: New expectations*. College Park: University of Maryland. Available at:

<https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/21858/Haufer.pdf>.

[11] Jackson, J. & Coolican, M. (2003). Healthy organizations and the link to peaceful societies: Strategies for implementing organizational change. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 36(2), 787-792.

[12] Joras, U. (2009). Motivating and impeding factors for corporate engagement in peacebuilding. *The Swiss Peace Foundation*. Available at:

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.628.1396&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.

[13] Killick N., Srikantha VS., & Gündüz, C. (2005). The role of local business in peacebuilding. *Center of Research for Constructive Research Management*. Available at: [www.berghof-handbook.net](http://www.berghof-handbook.net). Accessed on: 09.01.2018

[14] Lederach, JP. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington D.C: US Institute of Peace Press.

[15] Nelson, J. (2000). The business of peace: The private sector as a partner in conflict prevention and resolution. *The Prince of Whales Business Leaders Forum, International Alert*, Council on Economic Priorities.Folium Press.

[16] Rettberg, A. (2004). *Business-led peacebuilding in Colombia: Fad or future of a country in crisis?*. Final Report Crisis State Programme, London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

[17] United States Institute of Peace. (2012). *Special report: How business can foster peace*. Available at: <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/SR315.pdf>.

Accessed on: 09.08.2018

[18] UNGC. (2013). *Responsible business, advancing peace: Examples from companies, investors & global compact networks*. New York: UNGC.

[19] Van Tulder, R. & Van Tilburg, R. (2014). *Managing the transitions to a sustainable enterprise*. New York: Routledge.