



---

## The Business of Trust: A sociological orientation on social enterprise projects with disadvantaged citizens

 James Moir

Faculty of Design, Informatics and Business, Abertay University, Old College, Bell Street Dundee, DD1 1HG

---

### ABSTRACT

This conceptual paper explores issues related to trust in working with disadvantaged citizens on social enterprise initiatives. This type of work rests on trust as a core element since these initiatives involve citizens at the sharp end of inequality and deprivation, and who may consequently distrust those considered as outsiders. This paper considers the nature of social enterprises and how they seek to involve and improve the lives of those who live in disadvantaged communities. It draws on literature focused on involving such communities and how the trust process has been conceptualised and researched in organisational studies. An analysis is offered of the traditional psychological approach to trust, critiquing it from a perspective that considers citizen mistrust as being a reflection of past de-identification processes. This leads to applying the sociologist Harold Garfinkel's work on trust conditions as pre-conditions to be met by agencies proposing social enterprise work.

**Keywords:** social enterprise, disadvantage, trust conditions, sociology

---

### INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with the question of trust in building up relationships with disadvantaged citizens for projects in the field of social enterprise. Trust is one of the most important features of such kind of project, since they aim at empowering individuals who are situated at the sharp end of disadvantage within communities, and who perceive a low sense of agency in relation to improving their lives. Societal inequalities threaten trust at the fundamental level of identity and agency. This condition has a profound effect on citizens' capability and readiness to collaborate with other actors at a more general level beyond their direct communities. The significance of trust for the functioning of social enterprises goes beyond standard models of interpersonal trust building, touching upon sociological concerns with respect to identity and interaction. The first part of the paper discusses social enterprises and its aims as well as the important role that trust can play in those projects. It then provide as critical discussion of conventional psychological theories of trust that are based on the concepts of calculus, knowledge, and identification. The discussion then moves on to addressing the issue of trust from a sociological perspective, namely how it can be negotiated within interactions and how the issue of inequality can compromise these negotiations. In presenting this perspective, the paper builds build work by Garfinkel (2019 [1962]) concerning identity and interaction, and Garfinkel (1963) on trust as a condition for interaction. Finally, this perspective is applied to

an analysis of social enterprises as essentially dependent on interaction and trust building.

### **Disadvantaged citizens, social enterprises and trust**

The idea of the "social enterprise" was originally introduced by Arthur Okun (1973) and was characterized as a market-based enterprise providing a specific service for the collective good of society. Since then the concept has evolved with social enterprises defined as any private sector company that "sees social challenges as business opportunities and develops products or services that address these needs in a sustainable way [...] and consolidates business models with social purpose" (Portales, 2019:10). According to this understanding, social enterprises address social problems, in this case relating to deprived communities, with a business model aimed at revenue generation and with an orientation towards growth and scaling up activities, a perspective often aligning with private sector corporate social responsibility initiatives and implying an interface between the market and the non-profit/third sector (Portales, 2019:22). In practice this collaboration means the co-creation of goods and services which address the needs of marginalized people and of disadvantaged communities. Thus SEs are not only aiming at social improvement but are intrinsically embedded into local communities and local networks more so than conventional companies (Finlayson & Roy, 2018).

Often, social enterprise projects work with communities through attempts to tap into a sense of entrepreneurship. This understanding, has cast entrepreneurship as both a tool for alleviating poverty and a mechanism for achieving self-determination, and wealth creation (Bruton et al., 2013). Nonetheless, entrepreneurial actions take place within socio-cultural frames, social norms and institutions (Bruton et al., 2010). Entrepreneurship, therefore, should be framed within a network of related historical, cultural, social, political, and institutional constraints and opportunities, influencing an organization's possibilities for pursuing entrepreneurial activity, particularly within the social sector (Aidis et al., 2008; Roundy, 2019; Urbano et al., 2019; Welter, 2011). Specifically for SEs in deprived communities, the question arises as to how certain boundaries prevent citizens' participation and how such boundaries can be overcome to strengthen collaboration of actors and organizations. In this context, social enterprises form a part of an entrepreneurship ecosystem (Spanuth & Urbano, 2024) constituted by numerous public and private actors and institutions (Audretsch et al., 2021; Auschra et al., 2019; Carayannis et al., 2019). Enabling disadvantaged citizens to operate across these institutions remains a substantial hurdle that is not to be underestimated.

It can be tempting to adopt a neoliberal framework of entrepreneurship for overcoming deeply entrenched structural inequalities through notions of motivation, effort, and individual initiative (Martinez Dy, 2020; Mole and Mole, 2010; Ahl and Marlow, 2012). From a wider sociological perspective however, disadvantage is a complex issue linked with multiple, often intersectional, factors including class (Anderson & Miller, 2003), ethnicity (Ram et al., 2017; Vershinina et al., 2019); gender (Ahl & Marlow, 2012); disability (Kasperova & Kitching, 2014); age (Mallett & Wapshott, 2015); migrant and refugee status (Al-Dajani & Marlow, 2013; Sepulveda et al., 2011). The combination of factors may create a non-uniform profile within a disadvantaged community (Anthias, 2013), something which is particularly relevant when addressing the issue of trust for social enterprise community engagement. For example, Putnam (2007) noted the presence of lower trust levels in ethnically diverse communities, a pattern even when controlling for social and economic characteristics.

As a result, trust is a key component of social enterprise networks, enabling their effective functioning. Gaining and sustaining this trust is especially difficult in disadvantaged communities, where established institutions may be viewed with skepticism and their reach

may be weak in comparison to the stronger bonds of informal relationships. However, if this trust can be built, it provides social enterprises with a powerful tool for achieving their aims and impact (Mason, 2012; Czinkota et al., 2020). In essence, it represents a social practice, respecting communities and incorporating their perspectives in collaborative partnerships. This point leads to a focus on the interplay between social enterprises, disadvantage and social capital (Bertotti et al., 2012; Sacchetti & Campbell, 2014; Hidalgo et al., 2024). Trust between SEs and their communities is vital for supporting their networks. However, from a business perspective, even one focused on social goals, social capital can be problematic. Fenton et al. (1999) have pointed to how adoption of a "business-like" approach can be detrimental for trust relationships with citizens and can undermine the perceived trustworthiness of local not-for-profit organisations that embody community-based values. However, the boundaries between the private and public sectors can at times be blurred, damaging trust (Fenton et al., 1999, p. 25). Nonetheless, the findings by Hussain et al. (2025) show that disadvantaged groups can indeed pursue entrepreneurial activity despite not always following explanations based on psychological models, such as the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Their qualitative study involving unemployed women in a disadvantaged UK urban community, and indicated that, despite being burdened by multiple disadvantages, the women's positionalities encouraged entrepreneurial ambition, with some managing to turn intent into action.

Seanor and Meaton (2008: 26) asserted that "social enterprise is more than the promotion of business ethos and practices", and that the way business ethos is constructed has importance. For example, a study by Levander (2010) on Swedish social enterprises described the promotion of transformation stories turning 'problem identities' into 'resourceful identities'. This notion reinforces community engagement as an agent of social change, and thus helping address problems related to disadvantage and deprivation. However, this leaves unresolved the issue of trust, namely how citizens within disadvantaged communities engage with external agencies wishing to stimulate social enterprise activity as a means of addressing social issues. The research carried out by Finlayson and Roy (2018) in Scotland highlights how misinterpretations of the purpose of an SE project resulted in mistrust and confusion. In such contexts, the importance of discursive legitimation and the empowerment of communities to co-create solutions becomes paramount. Further research by Granados and Rosli (2020) identified stakeholder engagement as a crucial driver for social enterprises' local impact, reputation, and credibility.

To access a community and initiate social enterprise projects, it often becomes necessary to build relationships with local leaders, who can act as gatekeepers. Social enterprise initiatives should not appear as a threat to local leaders' position, and rather be portrayed as benefiting all parties (Raghubanshi et al., 2021). Once trust within a community is established, social enterprises can focus on embedding themselves by communicating their mission and activities effectively. While commercial enterprises utilise networks to expand market share, social enterprises aim to raise awareness and advocate for policy changes to benefit local communities. The foundation of all these activities is trust, as building closeness and support within vulnerable communities is essential (Seelos et al., 2011). Therefore, collaboration plays a key role in cultivating this trust and legitimacy.

It therefore seems evident that social enterprises rely heavily on citizen involvement in co-production (Eriksson, 2022). By allowing citizens to participate in their development and delivery, SEs can act as a means to achieve a high degree of social innovation. People in these communities should take on roles throughout the co-production process (Cepiku et al., 2020: 3-4) allowing for experience-based learning and knowledge transfer (Wu et al., 2015: 2251).

While social enterprises can take risks, their operational frameworks can also promote accountability, both individually and collectively (Defourny & Nyssens, 2021; Evers & Ewert, 2021). Ideally, this involves a blend of volunteer and professional contribution (Defourny & Nyssens, 2021; Evers & Ewert, 2021), and often involving complex, extended co-production models (Pestoff, 2015).

The importance of communication and interaction between actors, supported by public institutions through partnerships and innovative policies (Lindsay et al., 2018), facilitates the growth of social enterprises and the social enterprise ecosystems that drive social innovation (Terrestrial et al., 2020: 887-888; Mazzucato, 2019). Digital approaches and services can help SEs to become scalable and sustainable by contributing to the creation of service ecosystems rather than isolated services and fostering citizen inclusion (Paananen et al., 2021; Perikangas & Tuurnas, 2023).

However, securing trust and citizen engagement cannot be taken for granted as a mere process. Even if social enterprises focus on systemic social problems in deprived communities, ensuring equitable input from all stakeholders is essential. Instead of being treated as passive service recipients, citizens should be seen as active participants co-creating and delivering innovations through their unique insights (Windrum et al., 2016: 153-154). From the outset, a clear understanding is needed that these projects are initiated with citizens' agency to address their issues rather than imposed from outside for some external rationale. Third sector organizations, private businesses, and knowledge institutions, such as universities, may play a role in the development of such innovations, but their contributions should be centered on supporting the citizens involved.

### **Modelling the trust-building process**

How trust can be built and maintained, or broken and reconstructed, is a topic extensively researched, resulting in the identification of several general models of interpersonal trust development. One of the most influential is based on a tripartite model (Shapiro et al., 1992) which suggests three bases of trust building, including first, a calculative or instrumental basis (calculus), then, an epistemic or knowledge-based basis (knowledge) and finally a relational (identification) basis. However, this model represents a linear trajectory towards trust building which might not be sufficient to explain the process in all its complexity. Some scholars propose non-linear approaches using the concept of 'small wins' (Bryson, 1988), suggesting a cumulative process of trust building through repetitive interaction (Huxham & Vangen, 2013). This non-hierarchical process is based on an initial mutual trust, and a commitment to risk-taking (Huxham & Vangen, 2013; Jones & George, 1998; Lewicki et al., 2006).

The tripartite model is still largely used to classify three types of trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995; Sheppard & Tuchinsky, 1996). Calculus-based trust assumes the parties will engage in a relationship in pursuit of a net benefit. The calculus approach, seen as the first level of trust building, relies on a minimal trust but can be grounded in the opportunistic pursuit of self-interest, even leading to distrust (Bijlsma-Frankema & Costa, 2005; Lewicki et al., 2006). Knowledge-based trust is built on the prediction of the other party's behavior resulting from the experience of numerous interactions over time allowing for better understanding and thus informing decision-making. Identification-based trust emerges from the perception of shared values, preferences or beliefs acquired through interaction, which implies an internalization of these shared aspects, such that power differences become less relevant in decision making, due to the emergence of a common identity (Kasten, 2018). It is presumed that this common identity over-rides any opportunistic intent. It is generally understood that the tripartite model

represents a hierarchy, with identification-based trust being the most advanced form. Yet it is also seen as the most difficult form of trust to attain, as it involves significant risk in the event that trust is broken, and also because the high level of interdependence can be challenged.

Although the tripartite model offers an useful overview of trust building process, it is a simplified one, and does not reflect the dynamics of relations among those types, or the patterning of interactions that may involve elements of both trust and distrust. Other elements affecting trust building have been highlighted by several studies, such as individual differences in trust inclination, or the processes of judging the trustworthiness of another party (McKnight et al., 1998). The main limitation of the tripartite model is that it does not go beyond the psychological dimension, leaving the question of antecedents to trust and power disparities for different societal groups unaddressed, and in particular their positioning within contexts where their voice carries less weight or is completely silenced.

Farnese et al. (2022) used the tripartite trust model in a study of organizational culture in two Italian SEs and provided evidence for the integration of 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' logic in processes of trust building through 'institutional routines'. This work highlights the trust-building processes as non-linear, involving the reciprocal action between different dimensions. It does not point to a sequential trust process but instead features a norm of reciprocity, and an interchange between cognitive and affective processes across all dimensions. Millering (2006) has highlighted the dynamic nature of trust-building processes, emphasizing that trust can be constantly built up through constant reflection on the exchange between parties, and on this basis alone, greater degrees of trust can be reached (Koole, 2020).

While models of the trust process have been extensively explored to understand organization-level dynamics and operations, they have seldom been applied to SE stakeholders' and their relationship with SE initiators, particularly where there may be suspicion rooted in the systematic disidentification of citizens from disadvantaged communities. The majority of existing studies are centered on a psychological approach focusing on internal cognitive and affective states rather than the practicalities of interaction and how they might arise from widespread normative understandings of how to make sense and of how to act in certain given situations. The fundamental challenge lies in relating these shared normative methods to power and privilege dynamics, for a better social understanding of the way in which interactions unfold. In this approach, what should matter is not only how people are inclined to respond but, above all, what are the shared cultural resources and frameworks upon which they draw in their interactions. Crucial to this understanding is the effects of a misalignment in the usage of these cultural resources? This shift leads to move away from the internal mind, to focusing on actual interaction. It shifts the focus to the question of whether trust should be viewed as something that is forged through interaction or as a pre-condition that underpins meaningful exchanges.

### **Trust conditions**

In the context of social enterprises, trust is a key prerequisite for disadvantaged citizens who are being invited to participate in co-production initiatives. The prerequisite of trust becomes essential, for it is a challenge to win citizens over from being peripheral to being key agents of SE projects. This must take into consideration their marginality due to the inequalities they face in their daily lives. It requires a sociological outlook on trust, considering trust not as a result of interaction but rather as a pre-condition for meaningful interactions to unfold between project organizers and citizens, and therefore considering social prerequisites as embedded in

such exchanges.

Ethnomethodology, is one perspective where trust has been explored extensively and is considered of paramount importance. It investigates the 'folk' (ethno) methods for producing and enacting intelligibility in ongoing interactions. This perspective addresses social justice issues by understanding how power and privilege impact individuals who are normatively deemed marginal. Harold Garfinkel (1967), as founder of the approach, stressed that societal inequalities can create 'trust conditions' that deteriorate and as a result lead to incomprehensible interactions for the actors involved. Furthermore, he pointed out that individuals who deny the intelligibility of information from others, and that appears incongruous with their existing views on inequality, will likely resist challenges to those views. Therefore, it is important to recognize the influence of disadvantage and inequality on interactions between those within and those outside disadvantaged communities, This view highlights how this process may reinforce social expectations, and thus make them resistant to change.

In order to have intelligibility of interaction there must be conditions for which a mutual commitment to common practices or methods of sense making exist. In situations where such conditions do not exist, interactions become problematic and repeated interactions in such contexts can place those with disadvantaged identities in an even more precarious and marginal situation. This can lead to blaming them for interactional troubles, thus reinforcing power imbalances (Rawls & David, 2005). The core issue lies in the violation of the 'morality of appearances' (Goffman, 1959:251), namely a disregard for legitimizing another's self-presentation in interaction. For citizens of disadvantaged communities, this means their identities can be devalued or denied when interacting with those of a dominant identity.

According to Goffman (1959:13), the successful functioning of social interaction depends on an identity being sustained through 'a moral obligation to be treated in a manner that is in keeping with the definition of the situation'. This suggests the presence of some level of consensus among actors about how to behave, yet those in disadvantaged communities frequently encounter situations in which their identity presentation is not recognized, or in which they anticipate non-recognition and thus have concerns about the condition of trust. This scenario often triggers prejudicial expectations, which become reinforced by the context of exchange with the dominant majority, thereby fueling negative interactions. It is not surprising that marginalized communities either seek to avoid engagement or resort to defensive strategies. These defensive behaviours in turn reinforce stereotypical views, such as seeming difficult or non-cooperative. These responses, when performed by minority members, maintain a semblance of social order and cast them as being the 'type' expected by the majority group.

Identity is therefore something of a precarious social construction (Garfinkel, 2006 [1948]; Goffman, 1983; Rawls, 1987) whose accomplishment requires its recognition by other people in the course of interaction. The identities of people with disadvantages are often put to test and challenged. As Berger (1963: 103) highlighted, "human dignity is a matter of social permission" that individuals of disadvantaged background may not receive in their interactions with dominant others. This can lead to people from disadvantaged communities reinforcing boundaries by restricting themselves to their own community interactions where their identity is validated (Rawls, 2000), thereby maintaining a separation between majority and minority interactional orders and reinforcing the idea that disadvantaged communities are "problem areas".

Garfinkel's early work explored how inequality impacts on the differential treatment of citizens

in the United States, damaging the dignity of certain groups, including Jewish pre-medical students and transsexuals, as well as the mentally and physically disabled, and those diagnosed as mentally ill or 'intellectually retarded' (Garfinkel, 1967:116–185; Turowetz & Rawls, 2021). Through case studies he sought to demonstrate the 'practical methodologies' used by individuals who resist identifying as stigmatized to pass as 'normals.' These attempts to navigate the majority world entailed attempting to guess the assumptions held by others (white male, police, university admissions boards, etc.) about them and how they would be perceived by these dominant figures and social groups.

His breaching experiments evolved from his earlier focus on minorities and the troubles they faced, revealing the 'work' put in by the majority social actors to produce the appearance of normality in daily life. Such experiments highlighted constitutive expectancies through which interaction is ordered and confirmed the centrality of equality and mutual respect in everyday life for the enactment of intelligibility. Simply put, for interaction to be successful, an assumption of mutual trust is required in order to create social order. When there is inequality, interactional expectations can become confused, and the resulting breakdown leads to an incomplete realization of ordering practices, which is crucial to an understanding of trust in all its complexities. While classical models tend to conceptualize trust as being built up (or damaged) over the course of an interaction, as if the process was similar to persuasion (winning or losing trust through interaction), Garfinkel's framework treats trust conditions as being an analytical presupposition for identities. Trust, in fact, depends on the tacit understanding of the rules constitutive of the social situation and a mutual agreement among actors to abide by these rules.

Garfinkel's view is rooted in an argument by Durkheim (1893) that a social contract is a prerequisite for a society, based on an ethic of social justice. A similar idea was expressed by Parsons (1937) who stated that truly 'rational' citizens could only exist within society and as part of a contract in which they recognize each other's meaning, so there is a tacit social contract to guide shared meaning. Garfinkel drew upon the ideas of Durkheim on 'constitutive practices' and the focus of both Durkheim and Parsons on implicit social contract to explore trust conditions (Garfinkel, 2019 [1962]: Chapter 4), which is largely focused on inequalities as disruptive of the reciprocal relations implicit in such contract.

However, although much of this focus is on tacit knowledge, constitutive reciprocity, trust conditions can extend beyond the analysis of social inequality (Turowetz & Rawls, 2021: 8). Its potential as "a powerful analytical lens can help to illuminate how disadvantage and identity can contribute to systematic troubles in social interaction has not been fully appreciated" (Turowetz & Rawls, 2021: 8). Despite this, the approach has informed research on various marginalized and disadvantaged groups, including African Americans (Rawls, 2000; Rawls & Duck, 2017; Rawls et al., 2018), autistic children (Turowetz, 2015), and 'suspects' being subjected to police procedures (David et al., 2018). These studies often share a common concern with the ways in which identities considered to be 'troubled' in the course of interaction create breakdowns in the social conditions of trust. Citizens in disadvantaged communities are, therefore, more prone to being blamed, sanctioned or even subjected to violence. By exposing how minorities are more likely to experience interactional difficulties than their majority counterparts, Garfinkel demonstrates how social inequalities are capable of creating misunderstandings in interaction and perpetuating their reinforcement. Citizens from disadvantaged minorities have lived experience and a heightened awareness of such troubles in interaction.

Given the concerns outlined above regarding the central role of trust in the course of interaction and sense making, it is pertinent to consider this in the context of SEs. Citizens in disadvantaged communities are generally hesitant to collaborate with organizational actors who may aim at initiating communication around projects of involving social entrepreneurship. These people are likely to distrust the motives of such individuals, as well as creating problems in interactions. Trust as a process, as explained through the building of a mental capacity during interactions by means of organizational mechanisms is one thing. The antecedents of trust, situated in tacit and shared agreements as to the rules of the interaction situation, are quite another. Trust, for Garfinkel is found in the latter: when persons who are not from majority groups do not share these understandings, or when they have to guess what they are. Due to a history of routine problematic interactions with persons of majority groups these minority groups trust officials, as formal initiators of social enterprises, from the outset. These individuals typically comprise people from organizations such as universities, charities, and third sector bodies. Though the intent of social enterprises are noble for officials working in such environments, they are still likely to be mistrusted by disadvantaged minorities.

### **Implications for social enterprises**

There are two interrelated sets of implications that derive from the argument above; conceptual and practical. Considering the first, it becomes clear that an ethnomethodological understanding of trust conditions is incompatible with the widely used tripartite model of trust, and others derived from it. The conventional model defines trust as a linear development; first calculus based thinking, then knowledge based thinking, finally identification based thinking. Efforts to address the non-linearity of bases of trust within the frame of the tripartite model for the purpose of informing SEs by Farnese et al. (2022), though commendable, do not address the basic structure of the tripartite model itself. This model is the cornerstone for thinking of trust as linear but in contrast ethnomethodology liberates understanding of trust as non-linear and opens a space for thinking of trust as constitutive of interactional practices in terms of trust conditions premised on equality and reciprocity. Garfinkel considered the problems faced by disadvantaged groups to be central precisely because of how they reveal what the interactional meanings of their positions are with members of majority groups, and how a problem emerges when their identities are not considered as central. There is a dual problem for minority groups: first, the recognition of a moral order where they are considered outsiders to majority rules of interaction; second, how they engage with majority group members where they are alerted a misinterpretation of their intentions or actions resulting in failure in trust conditions.

The arguments presented in this paper advocate the benefits of a sociological insight in studying trust as a core aspect in initiating SE projects in disadvantaged communities. Social enterprise is more than the application of a business ethos for an altruistic purpose. Fundamentally, social enterprises are about social justice and community cohesion and these underlying values drive the initiatives that serve disadvantaged populations (Pearce, 2003). However, efforts to involve local disadvantaged communities can lead to a potential for mistrust. Garfinkel's understanding that trust conditions rest on reciprocity and cooperation are therefore central to the ethos of social enterprises. Trust can be viewed by project initiators within social enterprises projects in terms of winning over disadvantaged citizens. However, to do so implies a buy-in from these individuals is premised on them coming round to the view that to creating their own micro-businesses is for the good of the community. Using Garfinkel's perspective on trust conditions allows organizers to realise that necessary conditions need to be in place before a project is implemented, and this means the initiators of social enterprises need to interact with disadvantaged citizens for a prolonged period before initiating any projects.

This involves developing a familiarity with the communities, their social networks and ways of interacting and understanding. It is critical for project initiators to be aware that social inequity creates ways of interaction that differ significantly from those of members of majority groups, and that within these differing ways the concept of trust itself is likely to be perceived and experienced differently.

This means that those initiating social enterprises must understand how category the 'disadvantage' is established as an interventionary necessity for alleviating "problems". However, problematizing disadvantage in such a way runs the risk of engendering managerialist thinking and using a business ethos to alleviate it. A critical reflexive way of thinking for project initiators involved in social enterprises is required that enables collaboration and learning from within.

## **Conclusion**

Social enterprises are important now more than ever given decreasing public expenditure, citizens alienation, and growing social inequalities. However many social enterprise projects fail from the start as there is little attention devoted to how (mis)trust features in the initiation processes. A construal of trust as a problematic issue within the discourse of disadvantaged or impoverished communities through interactions with members of the dominant groups needs recognition. Minority groups are very often faced with problematic interactions with officials who come from the dominant majority group. The repetition of a failure in reciprocity of legitimate identity can be encountered and lead to mistrust, disengagement, or resistance.

However, social enterprises offer avenues through interaction to establish trust via processes of co-creation and co-production in an inclusive, equality-driven and socially just manner. The work of Garfinkel illustrates the socially constructed nature of meaning assemblage and what happens when members of minority groups do not share knowledge about the specific rules of interactional engagement as those of majority members. Initiating social enterprises requires careful attention on the issue of trust by project initiators. Trust cannot simply be viewed as an abstract conceptual idea, but rather as an inextricable component of interaction. Whilst fundraising for social enterprise projects may pose significant problems, building citizens' trust in their work can be an even greater one.

## **References**

1. Acuña, M., & Cabanilla, L. (2019). Filipino dietary patterns and cultural influences. *Philippine Nutrition Review*, 72(2), 67–74.
2. Bailey, R., Armour, K., Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., Sandford, R., & the BERA Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy Special Interest Group. (2009). The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: An academic review. *Research Papers in Education*, 24(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520701809817>
3. Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1>
4. Bernardo, A. B. I., & Tuazon, M. D. (2018). Students' engagement and satisfaction in physical education: Basis for instructional improvement. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(2), 56–63.
5. Casey, A., & O'Donovan, T. M. (2015). Students' experiences of physical education: A

- qualitative case study. *European Physical Education Review*, 21(3), 312–328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X14558849>
6. Commission on Higher Education (Philippines). (2013). CHED Memorandum Order No. 20, Series of 2013: General education curriculum: Holistic understandings, intellectual and civic competencies.
  7. Donnelly, J. E., Hillman, C. H., Castelli, D., Etnier, J. L., Lee, S., Tomporowski, P., & Szabo-Reed, A. N. (2016). Physical activity, fitness, cognitive function, and academic achievement in children: A systematic review. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 48(6), 1197–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000000901>
  8. Enriquez, J. M., & Agbulos, M. C. (2021). Implementation of PATHFIT in selected Philippine universities: Challenges and perspectives. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(1), 33–40.
  9. Laguador, J. M. (2015). Enhancing students' interest in sports through PATHFIT program. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 2(3), 82–87.
  10. Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
  11. Piaget, J. (1964). Development and learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 2(3), 176–186.
  12. Ramirez, A., Bautista, L., & Ong, J. (2020). Student food choices in dormitory settings. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health*, 32(4), 211–218.
  13. Reyes, J., & Francisco, M. (2019). Eating behaviors of university students. *Asian Journal of Health Research*, 3(2), 112–120.
  14. Sallis, J. F., Owen, N., & Fisher, E. B. (2012). Ecological models of health behavior. In K. Glanz, B. Rimer, & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed., pp. 465–486). Jossey-Bass.
  15. Tannehill, D., MacPhail, A., & Murphy, F. (2022). *Children's voices in physical education: Reimagining practice through participation*. Routledge.