Journal of Social Studies (JSS), ISSN: 1858-2656 (p); 2721-4036 (e)
Vol. 22. No. 1 (2026), pp. 43-60 doi: 10.21831/jss.v22i1.101311.

The relationship between social capital strength and social entrepreneurship among creative economy entrepreneurs: evidence from rumah kreatif coey, indonesia

ADINDA LARASATI UTOMO
Institut Pertanian Bogor, Indonesia
Email: adindalarasatiutomo@apps.ipb.ac.id

SAHARUDDIN
Institut Pertanian Bogor, Indonesia
Email: saharuddin@apps.ipb.ac.id

HANA INDRIANA
Institut Pertanian Bogor, Indonesia
Email: hanaindriana@apps.ipb.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This studies examining the relationship between social capital strength and social entrepreneurship among creative economy entrepreneurs remain limited. This study aims to analyze the level of social capital strength, the level of social entrepreneurship, and the relationship between the two variables among entrepreneurs participating in Rumah Kreatif Coey, Indonesia. A quantitative approach supported by qualitative data was employed. Data were collected from 45 culinary entrepreneurs through questionnaires, interviews, observations, and documentation. Descriptive statistics and Spearman Rank Correlation were used to analyze the data. The results show that both social capital strength and social entrepreneurship were generally at moderate to high levels. No significant relationship was found between entrepreneurs' characteristics and either social capital strength or social entrepreneurship. However, social capital strength was positively and significantly associated with social entrepreneurship. Among the dimensions of social capital, linking social capital demonstrated the strongest relationship with social entrepreneurship. These findings suggest that strengthening trust, social networks, and institutional linkages can enhance social entrepreneurship among creative economy entrepreneurs and contribute to community empowerment initiatives.
Keywords: creative economy, community empowerment, entrepreneurs, social capital strength, social entrepreneurship

INTRODUCTION

The creative economy has emerged as an important driver of economic growth, employment generation, and community empowerment in many countries. Unlike conventional economic sectors that rely primarily on physical resources, the creative economy emphasizes creativity, innovation, knowledge,

and intellectual capital as the main sources of value creation (Howkins, 2001; UNCTAD, 2008). In Indonesia, the creative economy has become increasingly important because it not only contributes to economic development but also creates opportunities for individuals and communities to improve their welfare through entrepreneurial activities based on local resources, creativity, and cultural values (Kementerian Pariwisata dan Ekonomi Kreatif Indonesia, 2020; El Hasanah, 2018). Furthermore, the creative economy contributes to employment creation, income generation, social development, and cultural preservation, making it a strategic sector for sustainable development (Budi, 2015).

Creative economy development is closely associated with the existence of creative communities. These communities function as collaborative spaces where individuals exchange knowledge, resources, and experiences to create innovative products and services (Florida, 2002; Howkins, 2001). Through collaboration, members gain opportunities to expand their networks, develop entrepreneurial skills, and strengthen their business capacities. In Indonesia, creative communities often integrate local wisdom and social values into entrepreneurial activities, thereby generating both economic and social benefits (Lindasari, 2018). Their inclusive nature enables participation from diverse groups, including women and small-scale entrepreneurs, while simultaneously promoting social empowerment through economic activities (Sopanah et al., 2021).

One example of such a community is Rumah Kreatif Coey, a creative economy community in Bogor that actively supports local entrepreneurs through training, mentoring, and collaborative programs. Beyond facilitating business development, Rumah Kreatif Coey serves as a platform for social interaction, cooperation, and collective learning among entrepreneurs. These interactions create opportunities for members to build relationships, share experiences, and access various forms of support that may contribute to both business development and social impact. Such conditions highlight the importance of social capital within community-based entrepreneurship.

Social capital has been widely recognized as an important resource that facilitates cooperation and collective action. According to Putnam (1993), social capital consists of networks, norms, and trust that enable individuals to work together effectively in achieving common goals. Similarly, Coleman (1988) argues that social capital functions as a social resource embedded within relationships that supports coordinated actions among individuals. Trust represents a fundamental component of social capital because it strengthens cooperation and encourages individuals to engage in collective activities for mutual benefit (Fukuyama, 2001). Social networks also play a crucial role by facilitating information exchange, cooperation, and access to resources among community members (Utami, 2020). Together with social norms, these elements form a foundation that enables communities to mobilize collective resources and achieve shared objectives (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000).

To better understand the functioning of social relationships, Woolcock (2001) classifies social capital into three dimensions: bonding, bridging, and linking social capital. Bonding social capital refers to strong ties among individuals within a relatively homogeneous group and is characterized by trust, solidarity, and mutual support. Bridging social capital refers to relationships that connect individuals across different social groups, enabling access to broader information, knowledge, and opportunities. Linking social capital refers to vertical relationships between community members and institutions that possess greater authority, resources, or influence, such as government agencies and supporting organizations (Woolcock, 2001). These dimensions are particularly relevant in community-based entrepreneurial settings because they facilitate collaboration, resource mobilization, and institutional support.

In addition to social capital, social entrepreneurship has gained increasing attention as an approach that combines entrepreneurial activities with social value creation. Social entrepreneurship seeks to address social problems through innovative and sustainable solutions while maintaining economic viability

(Dees, 1998; Yunus, 2007). Unlike conventional entrepreneurship, which primarily focuses on profit generation, social entrepreneurship prioritizes social impact and community welfare (Nicholls, 2006). Through innovation, collaboration, and community participation, social entrepreneurs aim to improve social conditions while ensuring the sustainability of their initiatives (Mulgan, 2006; Hulgard, 2010).

Praszkier and Nowak (2012) identify several dimensions of social entrepreneurship, including social mission, social innovation, and social change. In the context of community-based entrepreneurship, these dimensions enable entrepreneurs not only to achieve economic objectives but also to create broader social benefits for society. Furthermore, economic sustainability is considered an essential component because it ensures the continuity of entrepreneurial activities and their long-term contribution to community welfare (Goodland, 1995; Harris, 2000).

Previous studies have demonstrated a positive relationship between social capital and social entrepreneurship. Putri and Santoso (2022) found that social capital facilitates collaboration, reduces transaction costs, and supports the development of social entrepreneurial activities. Similarly, Rodríguez et al. (2023) argue that social capital enhances social entrepreneurship by enabling access to collective resources and strengthening social innovation. Wang and Li (2020) further show that social capital positively influences social entrepreneurial intentions by helping entrepreneurs transform resource limitations into social opportunities. These findings suggest that stronger social capital may contribute to higher levels of social entrepreneurship.

Despite growing scholarly interest in both social capital and social entrepreneurship, empirical studies examining the relationship between social capital strength and social entrepreneurship among creative economy entrepreneurs within community-based empowerment programs remain limited. Most previous studies have focused on entrepreneurial intention, business performance, or general community development, while relatively little attention has been paid to creative economy communities that integrate economic and social objectives simultaneously. This gap is particularly relevant in the context of Rumah Kreatif Coey, where entrepreneurial activities are closely linked to collaboration, empowerment, and social value creation.

Therefore, this study aims to analyze the level of social capital strength, the level of social entrepreneurship, and the relationship between these variables among creative economy entrepreneurs participating in Rumah Kreatif Coey. Specifically, the study examines the dimensions of bonding, bridging, and linking social capital and their relationship with social entrepreneurship. The findings are expected to contribute to the literature on social capital and social entrepreneurship while providing practical insights for community empowerment programs and creative economy development initiatives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Creative Economy and Creative Economy Communities

The creative economy refers to economic activities that utilize creativity, knowledge, innovation, and intellectual capital as primary resources for generating economic value. According to Howkins (2001), the creative economy emphasizes the transformation of creative ideas into products and services with economic value. Similarly, UNCTAD (2008) defines the creative economy as activities involving the creation, production, and distribution of goods and services based on creativity and intellectual property. In Indonesia, the creative economy is recognized as an important sector that contributes not only to

economic growth but also to employment creation, community empowerment, and cultural preservation (Kementerian Pariwisata dan Ekonomi Kreatif Indonesia, 2020).

The development of the creative economy is closely associated with the emergence of creative economy communities. These communities function as collaborative platforms that facilitate knowledge sharing, innovation, and resource exchange among members (Florida, 2002). Through collaboration, creative communities strengthen entrepreneurial capacity, encourage innovation, and support sustainable local economic development (Howkins, 2001). In Indonesia, creative economy communities often integrate local cultural values with modern innovation, enabling them to contribute to both economic and social development (Lindasari, 2018). The collaborative nature of such communities makes them an important setting for examining social capital and social entrepreneurship. This context is particularly relevant to Rumah Kreatif Coey, which promotes entrepreneurial development through training, mentoring, and collaborative activities among creative economy entrepreneurs.

Social Capital

Social capital is widely recognized as a valuable social resource that facilitates cooperation, coordination, and collective action. Bourdieu (1986) defines social capital as the actual or potential resources linked to durable networks of relationships and mutual recognition. Coleman (1988) views social capital as a resource embedded within social structures that enables individuals to achieve collective goals. Meanwhile, Putnam (1993) conceptualizes social capital as networks, norms, and trust that facilitate cooperation for mutual benefit.

Trust represents a fundamental component of social capital because it encourages cooperation and reduces uncertainty in social interactions (Fukuyama, 2001). Social networks provide channels for information exchange, resource mobilization, and collaboration among individuals and groups (Utami, 2020). Social norms function as shared rules that guide behavior and support collective action (Harahap & Agusta, 2018). Together, these elements strengthen social relationships and contribute to community development.

According to Woolcock (2001), social capital can be categorized into three dimensions: bonding, bridging, and linking social capital.

a. Bonding Social Capital

Bonding social capital refers to strong relationships among individuals who share similar backgrounds, values, or identities (Woolcock, 2001). These relationships are characterized by trust, solidarity, and mutual support. In entrepreneurial communities, bonding social capital promotes cooperation and strengthens members' commitment to collective goals. Strong bonding relationships may also provide emotional and practical support for entrepreneurs facing business challenges.

b. Bridging Social Capital

Bridging social capital refers to connections between individuals or groups from different social backgrounds (Woolcock, 2001). Through these relationships, individuals gain access to new information, ideas, and opportunities beyond their immediate social circles. Bridging social capital supports innovation and collaboration by facilitating interactions across different communities and sectors. For entrepreneurs, bridging relationships can expand market opportunities and increase access to external knowledge.

c. Linking Social Capital

Linking social capital refers to relationships between individuals or communities and institutions with greater authority, resources, or power (Woolcock, 2001). Such relationships provide access to government programs, financial assistance, training opportunities, and institutional support. For entrepreneurs, linking

social capital is particularly important because it enhances access to resources that contribute to business development and sustainability.

Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is generally understood as the application of entrepreneurial principles to address social problems and create social value. Dees (1998) describes social entrepreneurship as a process of creating social change through innovative and sustainable actions. Yunus (2007) argues that social entrepreneurship focuses on solving social problems rather than maximizing private profit. Similarly, Nicholls (2006) emphasizes that social entrepreneurship prioritizes social impact while maintaining economic viability.

Social entrepreneurship combines innovation, community participation, and business practices to create sustainable solutions for social issues such as poverty, inequality, education, and environmental problems (Mulgan, 2006). In this regard, social entrepreneurs seek opportunities to improve community welfare while ensuring the sustainability of their initiatives. This study adopts three dimensions of social entrepreneurship: social innovation, social mission, and economic sustainability.

a. Social Innovation

Social innovation refers to the development of new ideas, products, services, or approaches that address social problems more effectively than existing solutions (Phills et al., 2008). Social innovation enables entrepreneurs to respond creatively to community needs while generating positive social impacts. According to Murray, Caulier-Grice, and Mulgan (2010), social innovation creates social value by providing solutions that improve the well-being of individuals and communities.

b. Social Mission

Social mission represents the commitment to creating social value and addressing community needs through entrepreneurial activities (Ebrahim et al., 2021). Unlike conventional entrepreneurs who primarily focus on financial gains, social entrepreneurs place social objectives at the center of decision-making processes. The social mission serves as a guiding principle that shapes organizational strategies and activities.

c. Economic Sustainability

Economic sustainability refers to the ability of entrepreneurial activities to maintain long-term financial viability while continuing to create social value (Goodland, 1995). Sustainable enterprises generate sufficient economic resources to support ongoing operations and social initiatives. According to Harris (2000), economic sustainability involves efficient resource management, long-term stability, and equitable economic opportunities.

Characteristics of Entrepreneurs

Entrepreneur characteristics are individual attributes that may influence entrepreneurial behavior, social interaction, and participation in community activities. In this study, entrepreneur characteristics include age, educational attainment, income level, business duration, and business type. According to

Rogers (2003), individual characteristics affect the adoption of innovation and participation in social networks. Education contributes to knowledge and skills development, while business experience may strengthen entrepreneurial capacity and social relationships. These characteristics may influence both social capital formation and social entrepreneurship among creative economy entrepreneurs.

Relationship between Entrepreneur Characteristics, Social Capital, and Social Entrepreneurship

Previous studies suggest that entrepreneur characteristics can influence both social capital and social entrepreneurship. Individuals with higher educational attainment and longer business experience tend to possess broader social networks and stronger capacities for collaboration (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000). Similarly, entrepreneur characteristics such as experience, motivation, and social background have been identified as important factors influencing social entrepreneurship (Gabarret et al., 2018). Wanyoike and Maseno (2021) further argue that entrepreneurial experience and achievement motivation contribute significantly to social entrepreneurial activities. Therefore, entrepreneur characteristics may play a role in shaping social capital and social entrepreneurship among members of Rumah Kreatif Coey.

Relationship between Social Capital and Social Entrepreneurship

The relationship between social capital and social entrepreneurship has been widely discussed in the literature. Social capital provides access to information, resources, and collaborative opportunities that support the creation of social value (Putnam, 2000). Putri and Santoso (2022) found that social capital positively contributes to social entrepreneurship by reducing transaction costs and facilitating cooperation among community members. Rodríguez et al. (2023) further demonstrate that social capital enables social entrepreneurs to mobilize collective resources and strengthen social innovation. Similarly, Wang and Li (2020) found that social capital positively influences social entrepreneurial intentions by helping entrepreneurs transform limited resources into opportunities for social impact.

Within creative economy communities, social capital strengthens cooperation, trust, and networking among entrepreneurs. Strong bonding relationships enhance solidarity, bridging relationships facilitate access to broader opportunities, and linking relationships connect entrepreneurs with supporting institutions. Therefore, stronger social capital is expected to be associated with higher levels of social entrepreneurship.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative research approach supported by qualitative data to examine the relationship between social capital and social entrepreneurship among creative economy entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey, Bogor Regency, West Java, Indonesia.

The respondents in this study were 45 culinary (tata boga) participants who are active members of Rumah Kreatif Coey. Respondents were selected using a purposive sampling technique based on the criteria of entrepreneurs who are actively running food-related businesses and participating in the culinary training program.

In addition, key informants were selected purposively to support the qualitative data. The informants consisted of Rumah Kreatif Coey management and representatives of the culinary entrepreneurs, who were considered to have in-depth knowledge regarding program implementation and entrepreneurial practices.

Data were collected from May to June 2026 using structured questionnaires as the primary instrument, supported by in-depth interviews, observation, and document analysis to ensure data triangulation.

The questionnaire measured two main variables: social capital and social entrepreneurship. Social capital was operationalized through three dimensions: bonding, bridging, and linking social capital, while social entrepreneurship was measured through social innovation and social mission. All indicators were assessed using a Likert scale.

Instrument validity and reliability tests were conducted to ensure data quality. Data analysis was performed using descriptive statistics and Spearman Rank Correlation, processed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 29, to examine the relationship between variables considering the ordinal measurement scale.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey

Entrepreneurs participating in Rumah Kreatif Coey exhibit diverse characteristics in terms of age, gender, type of business, length of participation, level of involvement, income, and education. This diversity reflects differing business backgrounds, levels of experience, and degrees of participation in the training activities offered by the community. The distribution of entrepreneur characteristics is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Characteristics of Entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey, 2026 (n = 45)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Age (years)	17–30	12	26.7
	31–45	17	37.8
	46–55	12	26.7
	56–70	4	8.9
Gender	Female	45	100.0
	Male	0	0.0
Business type	Heavy meals	7	15.6
	Cakes and bread	17	37.8
	Beverages	5	11.1
	Snacks	16	35.6
Length of participation	< 2 months	9	20.0
	2–5 months	13	28.9
	6–11 months	10	22.2
	> 1 year	13	28.9
Level of involvement	Rarely	10	22.2
	Often	26	57.8
	Always	9	20.0
Income (IDR/month)	< 1,000,000	14	31.1

	1,000,000–< 3,000,000	18	40.0
	3,000,000–< 5,000,000	9	20.0
	> 5,000,000	4	8.9
Education	Junior high school	1	2.2
	Senior high school	17	37.8
	Diploma/Bachelor	27	60.0

All respondents (100%) were women, confirming that Rumah Kreatif Coey functions as an inclusive, community-based platform for women's economic empowerment. This is consistent with the statement of the community founder:

"Our main goal is to help the community, especially women, become economically independent without abandoning their role at home. We hope women can remain productive while still being active from home." (CM, 52 years old)

Most entrepreneurs were in the productive age range of 31–45 years (37.8%), followed in equal proportion by the 17–30 and 46–55 age groups (26.7% each), while the 56–70 age group represented the smallest share (8.9%). In terms of business type, cake and bread businesses were most common (37.8%), followed by snacks (35.6%), heavy meals (15.6%), and beverages (11.1%), reflecting the dominance of household-scale, food-based enterprises. Regarding length of participation, entrepreneurs were relatively evenly distributed across categories, with the highest proportions found among those who had joined for 2–5 months and more than one year (28.9% each). More than half of the entrepreneurs (57.8%) reported a "often" level of involvement, and none reported never participating, indicating a relatively active level of engagement. With respect to income, the largest group (40.0%) earned between IDR 1,000,000 and less than IDR 3,000,000 per month, and the majority of entrepreneurs (60.0%) had attained Diploma or Bachelor-level education.

The dominance of women entrepreneurs in the productive age range, with relatively high educational attainment yet modest incomes, indicates that Rumah Kreatif Coey has succeeded in reaching an economically vulnerable group and providing an inclusive space for community-based empowerment. This is consistent with *Woolcock and Narayan (2000)*, who argue that well-managed communities are able to bring together individuals from diverse backgrounds to build social capital collectively. The active engagement observed among entrepreneurs also constitutes important initial capital for the growth of social entrepreneurship, since consistent participation opens space for the internalization of innovation and social-mission values.

Level of Social Capital among Entrepreneurs

Social capital is a multidimensional concept referring to networks, norms, and trust that enable coordination and cooperation among individuals in achieving common goals (*Putnam, 1993*). It is commonly classified into three dimensions: *bonding social capital*, reflecting ties within a relatively homogeneous group; *bridging social capital*, connecting different groups; and *linking social capital*, concerning the relationship between the community and formal institutions or authorities (*Woolcock and Narayan, 2000*). The presence of all three dimensions is reflected in Rumah Kreatif Coey, as expressed by its founder:

"The management seeks to build mutual trust and cooperation through group activities and shared practice. This learning environment shapes the exchange of information and strengthens solidarity." (CM, 52 years old)

Interaction within the program strengthens ties among members within the group (*bonding*), encourages the exchange of information across different business backgrounds (*bridging*), and expands access to external support and resources (*linking*). The level of each social capital dimension among entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey is presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Level of Social Capital Dimensions among Entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey, 2026 (n = 45)

Dimension	Low (n)	Low (%)	Moderate (n)	Moderate (%)	High (n)	High (%)
Bonding	0	0.0	22	48.9	23	51.1
Bridging	0	0.0	29	64.4	16	35.6
Linking	0	0.0	28	62.2	17	37.8

a. Bonding Social Capital

Table 2 shows that most entrepreneurs (51.1%) exhibited a high level of bonding social capital, followed by a moderate level (48.9%), with none in the low category. This indicates that internal relationships among entrepreneurs were strongly established through routine interaction during training and joint business activities, fostering trust and mutual support that facilitate the exchange of information, business experience, and cooperation. One culinary participant explained that closeness among members extends beyond formal activities:

"Relationships among participants are very good and close. We often interact, help each other, and share experience related to our respective food businesses. This closeness does not only occur during activities, but also continues outside of them." (NVT, 27 years old)

This closeness is reflected in concrete forms of mutual support, such as giving feedback on product quality, helping with production, and sharing information about ingredients and marketing strategies, as expressed by another participant:

"The support we feel includes giving each other feedback on taste and appearance, helping in the production process, and sharing information about ingredients and marketing tips. Trust among participants can be seen from the cooperation in several business activities." (NYL, 34 years old)

These findings indicate that Rumah Kreatif Coey has succeeded in building a strong sense of trust and solidarity among its participants. A high level of bonding social capital is characterized by strong norms of reciprocity, trust among members, and the formation of a shared identity (*Putnam, 2000*). However, the dominance of bonding social capital may lead to exclusivity if not balanced with bridging and linking social capital (*Putnam, 2000*), underscoring the importance of examining these latter two dimensions.

b. Bridging Social Capital

Table 2 shows that most entrepreneurs (64.4%) were at the moderate level of bridging social capital, while 35.6% were at the high level, with none in the low category. This indicates that cross-group relationships have begun to form, but have not yet developed optimally; most entrepreneurs still build relationships mainly within the internal environment of Rumah Kreatif Coey rather than with outside parties, and continue to rely on their immediate surroundings for product marketing, as reflected in the following statement:

"For marketing, I still mostly rely on my neighborhood or my own acquaintances. I do not yet have many outside connections to help promote my products." (NVT, 27 years old)

This finding is consistent with *Woolcock (2001)*, who explains that bridging social capital connects individuals with social groups outside their community of origin, thereby opening access to new information and opportunities. The moderate level of bridging social capital observed suggests an opportunity for Rumah Kreatif Coey to strengthen cross-group networks through more structured collaborative activities.

c. Linking Social Capital

Table 2 shows that 62.2% of entrepreneurs were at the moderate level of linking social capital and 37.8% at the high level, with none in the low category. Linking social capital refers to the vertical relationship between individuals or communities and parties with greater authority or resources, such as government agencies or supporting institutions (*Woolcock, 2001*), providing entrepreneurs with access to training, mentoring, marketing information, and entrepreneurial capacity development. The founder of Rumah Kreatif Coey explained that the community has built partnerships with several external institutions:

"Rumah Kreatif Coey collaborates with various external parties, including the government, such as the Social Affairs Office and the Trade, Cooperatives, and SME Office, as well as related institutions, in the form of facility support, funding, and opportunities to take part in coaching programs. This collaboration supports the continuity of our activities and the capacity building of our participants." (CM, 52 years old)

The role of Rumah Kreatif Coey as a bridge to external networks was also recognized directly by the participants:

"Rumah Kreatif Coey plays an important role as a bridge between participants and outside parties who can support business development. The program does not only provide training, but also opens access to a wider network." (WRD, 25 years old)

Overview of Social Capital Dimensions

Overall, the three social capital dimensions among Rumah Kreatif Coey entrepreneurs were at the moderate-to-high level. Bonding social capital showed the highest proportion of entrepreneurs in the high category (51.1%), followed by linking (37.8%) and bridging (35.6%). This pattern suggests that Rumah Kreatif Coey has successfully built strong internal ties among its members through consistent trust, solidarity, and reciprocal norms, while the capacity to establish cross-group relationships (bridging) and access to formal institutional networks (linking) still require further strengthening. This is consistent with *Putnam (2000)*, who argues that a healthy community should ideally maintain a balance among the three dimensions of social capital so as to remain not only internally strong, but also adaptive and responsive to external opportunities.

Level of Social Entrepreneurship among Entrepreneurs

Social entrepreneurship is a form of entrepreneurial activity that is not solely oriented toward economic profit, but also emphasizes the creation of social value for the community (*Austin et al., 2006*). This study examines three key dimensions of social entrepreneurship — social innovation, social mission, and economic sustainability (*Nicholls, 2006*) — which mutually reinforce one another: social innovation generates new solutions, social mission provides direction, and economic sustainability ensures the

continuity of the enterprise in the long run. The level of each dimension among entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey is presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Level of Social Entrepreneurship Dimensions among Entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey, 2026 (n = 45)

Dimension	Low (n)	Low (%)	Moderate (n)	Moderate (%)	High (n)	High (%)
Social innovation	0	0.0	28	62.2	17	37.8
Social mission	0	0.0	28	62.2	17	37.8
Economic sustainability	0	0.0	30	66.7	15	33.3

a. Social Innovation

Table 3 shows that most entrepreneurs (62.2%) were at the moderate level of social innovation and 37.8% at the high level, with none in the low category. Social innovation among Rumah Kreatif Coey entrepreneurs is reflected in their ability to develop creative food products based on local resources, as illustrated by one participant's experience:

"Before, I only made cakes for my family to eat, but after joining the culinary training I learned about product variation and packaging, and eventually dared to sell them — and it turned out many people liked them." (NVT, 27 years old)

The culinary mentor confirmed that every training session was directed toward encouraging participants' creativity:

"Participants are encouraged to modify their products according to market needs and local conditions. Creativity in processing simple ingredients into higher-value products is always emphasized in every training session." (AT, 40 years old)

The dominance of the moderate category indicates that entrepreneurs' innovation capacity still has room for improvement, constrained by limited access to technology, market information, and business capital. Even so, the innovation that has emerged reflects a shift in participants' mindset toward becoming more creative, independent, and opportunity-oriented, consistent with *Martin and Osberg (2007)*, who explain that social innovation is a key characteristic of social entrepreneurship in generating solutions to social problems.

b. Social Mission

Table 3 shows that 62.2% of entrepreneurs were at the moderate level of social mission and 37.8% at the high level. The business activities carried out by Rumah Kreatif Coey entrepreneurs are not solely focused on economic profit, but also aim to empower the surrounding community, particularly women, through skills development and business opportunity creation. This is consistent with *Mair and Martí (2006)*, who explain that social entrepreneurship centers on the creation of social value through innovative

activities that generate positive impacts for society. One participant reflected on this empowerment orientation:

"Here, we are not only taught how to make products, but also helped to become more confident and to be able to earn our own income." (WRD, 25 years old)

This is reinforced by the founder's explanation of the community's underlying purpose:

"The main purpose of establishing Rumah Kreatif Coey is to encourage the economic independence of the community, especially women, without neglecting their role at home. The skills provided are expected to become a foundation for creating business opportunities and improving family welfare." (CM, 52 years old)

The dominance of entrepreneurs in the moderate-to-high categories shows that the value of social mission has been reasonably well internalized. *Hulgård (2010)* notes that strengthening social mission within business communities can enhance social cohesion and reinforce community resilience against economic pressure. Nevertheless, a strong social mission that is not supported by adequate economic sustainability will be difficult to maintain in the long run, making economic sustainability the next dimension requiring closer examination.

c. Economic Sustainability

Table 3 shows that 66.7% of entrepreneurs were at the moderate level of economic sustainability and 33.3% at the high level, with none in the low category. Business activities conducted by participants have provided economic benefits through additional income and business development opportunities, although most enterprises remain small in scale, as reflected in one participant's statement:

"Now I have additional income, even though it is not yet large — it is enough to help with daily needs." (NVT, 27 years old)

The founder of Rumah Kreatif Coey observed a broader pattern of increasing independence among participants:

"The impact is already visible — participants have become more independent in running their businesses. Some have started their own businesses, and others have developed businesses they already had." (CM, 52 years old)

Despite this progress, some entrepreneurs still face challenges in maintaining business continuity, particularly related to capital, marketing, and production consistency:

"After the training, the challenges are still in capital, marketing, and keeping production consistent, so applying what we learned still needs adjustment." (NVT, 27 years old)

Economic sustainability is a key aspect of social entrepreneurship that determines an enterprise's capacity to continue operating while sustaining its social impact (*Alter, 2007*). *Dacin et al. (2011)* suggest that economic sustainability can be strengthened through income diversification, product-identity reinforcement, and expanded market access, including through digital platforms.

Overview of Social Entrepreneurship Dimensions

Overall, the three social entrepreneurship dimensions among Rumah Kreatif Coey entrepreneurs were at the moderate-to-high level. Social innovation and social mission showed identical distributions (62.2% moderate, 37.8% high), while economic sustainability showed the highest proportion of entrepreneurs in the moderate category (66.7%) among the three dimensions. This pattern indicates that the values of social innovation and social mission have begun to develop and become reasonably well internalized through the training program at Rumah Kreatif Coey, while economic sustainability — as the ultimate outcome of the social entrepreneurship process — requires a longer time to stabilize, consistent with *Dees (1998)*, who argues that social entrepreneurs require not only a strong mission orientation, but also the capacity to sustain their businesses economically so that the resulting social impact can endure.

Relationship between Entrepreneur Characteristics and Social Capital and Social Entrepreneurship

The relationship between entrepreneur characteristics (business type, length of participation, involvement, income, and education) and both social capital and social entrepreneurship was examined using the Chi-square test for the categorical variable of business type, and Spearman Rank correlation for the ordinal variables. As shown in Table 4, none of the entrepreneur characteristics were significantly related to either social capital or social entrepreneurship ($p > 0.05$), and the correlation coefficients obtained were consistently very weak.

Table 4 Relationship between Entrepreneur Characteristics and the Level of Social Capital and Social Entrepreneurship

Characteristic	Social capital (coef./χ^2)	Sig.	Social entrepreneurship (coef./χ^2)	Sig.	Remarks
Business type (χ^2)	2.084	0.555	3.673	0.299	Not significant
Length of participation (rs)	0.149	0.329	-0.024	0.875	Not significant
Involvement (rs)	-0.039	0.799	-0.046	0.763	Not significant
Income (rs)	0.161	0.291	0.119	0.437	Not significant
Education (rs)	0.169	0.266	0.105	0.494	Not significant

These findings indicate that social capital and social entrepreneurship among Rumah Kreatif Coey entrepreneurs are shaped less by individual demographic attributes and more by the process of collective interaction and participation within the program. This is supported by qualitative findings; the community founder explained that the program was intentionally designed so that interaction among members would not be influenced by differences in business background:

"Here, all participants learn together — there is no distinction between those who already have a large business and those who are just starting out. In fact, those who already have a business can share their experience with those who do not yet, and that is very helpful." (CM, 52 years old)

This mentor also observed that discussion across different business types occurred without barriers:

"A participant who sells cakes can discuss with a participant who sells heavy meals — they give each other input on packaging, pricing, even how to sell online. There are no boundaries; everyone learns from everyone." (LN, 45 years old)

This is consistent with the view that social capital is contextual and relational, formed through the structure of relationships among individuals (*Coleman, 1988*), and with *Austin et al. (2006)*, who argue that social entrepreneurship orientation is shaped more by the community environment and learning process than by demographic attributes. Taken together, the absence of a significant relationship between entrepreneur characteristics and either social capital or social entrepreneurship reflects the success of Rumah Kreatif Coey in creating an inclusive learning environment, in which all entrepreneurs — regardless of business type, education, income, or length of participation — have a relatively equal opportunity to develop both social capital and social entrepreneurship.

Relationship between Social Capital and Social Entrepreneurship

The relationship between social capital and social entrepreneurship has been widely discussed in the sociology of economic development. Social capital is considered capable of enhancing innovation and entrepreneurial capacity by providing information, social support, and stronger trust among individuals (*Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998*), functioning as a driving factor that accelerates the identification of social opportunities, the mobilization of resources, and the implementation of innovative solutions (*Mair and Martí, 2006*). A culinary mentor described how the social network among participants directly supports business development:

"Relationships and networks among participants play an important role in helping business development. The presence of participants who already have a business, even one that has grown quite well, gives other participants the opportunity to learn through direct experience." (LN, 45 years old)

Table 5 Relationship between Social Capital Dimensions and the Level of Social Entrepreneurship at Rumah Kreatif Coey, 2026

Dimension	Correlation coefficient (r_s)	Sig. (p)	Interpretation
Bonding	0.651	< 0.001	Strong
Bridging	0.458	0.002	Moderate
Linking	0.802	< 0.001	Very strong

Table 5 shows that all three dimensions of social capital were positively and significantly related to social entrepreneurship ($p < 0.05$). Based on the correlation-coefficient classification of *Effendi and Tukiran (2012)* — 0.00–0.25 (very weak), 0.26–0.50 (moderate), 0.51–0.75 (strong), 0.76–0.99 (very strong), and 1.00 (perfect) — bonding social capital showed a strong relationship with social entrepreneurship ($r = 0.651$, $p < 0.001$), bridging social capital showed a moderate relationship ($r = 0.458$, $p = 0.002$), and linking social capital showed the strongest, very strong relationship ($r = 0.802$, $p < 0.001$).

The strong relationship between bonding social capital and social entrepreneurship indicates that solidarity, trust, and reciprocal norms among entrepreneurs form the primary foundation for the development of social entrepreneurship, encouraging members to take risks, share knowledge, and collaborate in various business activities. One participant reflected on this benefit directly:

"Relationships among participants are quite close, and that becomes the community's main strength. From there, participants can share information, resources, and support, which in the end helps keep the business running." (NYL, 34 years old)

This finding is consistent with *Adler and Kwon (2002)*, who state that trust, as the core element of bonding social capital, encourages the collaborative behavior characteristic of social entrepreneurs.

The moderate relationship between bridging social capital and social entrepreneurship (r = 0.458) suggests that the ability to establish cross-group relationships also contributes significantly, although to a lesser extent than bonding. Bridging social capital enables entrepreneurs to access new ideas, best practices from other communities, and wider market opportunities, since individuals who connect different groups tend to be more innovative through their access to diverse information (*Burt, 2004*).

The strongest relationship was found between linking social capital and social entrepreneurship (r = 0.802), confirming that access to formal institutions, government programs, financial institutions, and institutional support is the most decisive factor in the development of social entrepreneurship at Rumah Kreatif Coey. A more detailed analysis of the relationship between each social capital dimension and the specific indicators of social entrepreneurship is presented in Table 6.

Table 6 Correlation between Social Capital Dimensions and Social Entrepreneurship Indicators at Rumah Kreatif Coey, 2026

Social capital dimension	Social innovation (r_s / p)	Social mission (r_s / p)	Economic sustainability (r_s / p)
Bonding	0.654 / < 0.001	0.666 / < 0.001	0.578 / < 0.001
Bridging	0.504 / < 0.001	0.453 / 0.002	0.342 / 0.022
Linking	0.787 / < 0.001	0.774 / < 0.001	0.732 / < 0.001

Table 6 shows that bonding social capital was most strongly related to social mission (r = 0.666), followed by social innovation (r = 0.654) and economic sustainability (r = 0.578); bridging social capital was most strongly related to social innovation (r = 0.504), followed by social mission (r = 0.453) and economic sustainability (r = 0.342); and linking social capital exhibited the strongest relationships overall, particularly with social innovation (r = 0.787), followed by social mission (r = 0.774) and economic sustainability (r = 0.732). These results indicate that access to external institutions with greater capacity — mentors, community management, government agencies, and partner organizations — played the most decisive role in driving innovation, reinforcing social mission, and supporting the economic sustainability of entrepreneurs' businesses. This is illustrated by two participants' accounts of the community's role as a bridge to external networks:

"Rumah Kreatif Coey plays an important role as a bridge between participants and outside parties who can support business development. The program does not only provide training, but also opens access to a wider network." (WRD, 25 years old)

"I usually join bazaars or external training as well. Sometimes we also collaborate with the Social Affairs Office, other communities, or fellow small-business owners to promote and market our products." (NYL, 34 years old)

Taken together, these findings support the study's hypothesis that social capital is significantly related to the level of social entrepreneurship among creative economy entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey. The stronger the social capital possessed by entrepreneurs — whether in terms of internal solidarity, cross-group networking, or access to formal institutions — the higher the level of social entrepreneurship achieved, with linking social capital emerging as the most determinant dimension. This finding reinforces the relevance of social capital as a strategic approach for supporting the success of community-based economic empowerment programs, consistent with *Woolcock (2001)*, who emphasizes that linking social capital provides access to resources and opportunities held by parties with greater authority. Consequently, these results reinforce the strategic relevance of leveraging social capital, particularly formal institutional linkages, to enhance the effectiveness of community-based economic empowerment programs.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the level of social capital strength, the level of social entrepreneurship, and the relationship between these variables among creative economy entrepreneurs at Rumah Kreatif Coey. The findings indicate that both social capital strength and social entrepreneurship have been developed at moderate to high levels through community-based entrepreneurial activities. Entrepreneur characteristics, including business type, length of participation, level of involvement, income, and educational attainment, were not associated with either social capital or social entrepreneurship, suggesting that the development of both constructs is influenced more by collective learning processes and community interaction than by individual demographic characteristics.

The study also confirms the research hypothesis by demonstrating a positive and significant relationship between social capital strength and social entrepreneurship. Bonding, bridging, and linking social capital all contributed to strengthening social entrepreneurship, with linking social capital emerging as the most influential dimension. These findings emphasize that trust, collaborative networks, and especially strong connections with external institutions provide essential resources, knowledge, and opportunities that foster social innovation, reinforce social mission, and support the long-term sustainability of entrepreneurial activities. Therefore, social capital should be regarded as a strategic resource for strengthening community-based entrepreneurship and promoting sustainable community empowerment.

Future studies are encouraged to involve a larger and more diverse sample of creative economy entrepreneurs from different sectors and regions to improve the generalizability of the findings. Longitudinal research is also recommended to examine how social capital and social entrepreneurship evolve over time. From a practical perspective, community empowerment organizations and policymakers should strengthen institutional partnerships, expand cross-community networking opportunities, and provide continuous mentoring and business support to further enhance social entrepreneurship among creative economy entrepreneurs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to Dr. Ir. Saharuddin, M.Si. for his guidance, valuable suggestions, and continuous support throughout this research. The author also extends sincere appreciation to Mrs. Hana Indriana, S.P., M.Si. for her guidance and constructive feedback during the research process. Special thanks are also extended to the management of Rumah Kreatif Coey, all culinary entrepreneurs who participated as respondents, and all informants for their cooperation, valuable insights, and willingness to contribute to this study.

FUNDING STATEMENT

This work did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Ethical approval was not required because this study involved voluntary participation through questionnaires and interviews with adult entrepreneurs without medical intervention, clinical procedures, or the collection of sensitive personal health data.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper

REFERENCES

1. Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S. W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, *27*(1), 17–40.
2. Alter, S. K. (2007). *Social enterprise typology*. Virtue Ventures LLC.
3. Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *30*(1), 1–22.
4. Budi, S. T. (2015). *Pengembangan Higher Order Four Cs (HOS4C) pendukung industri kreatif* [Laporan penelitian].
5. Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, *110*(2), 349–399.
6. Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*, S95–S120.
7. Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, *22*(5), 1203–1213.
8. Dees, J. G. (1998). *The meaning of social entrepreneurship*. Stanford University.
9. Effendi, S., & Tukiran. (2012). *Metode penelitian survei*. LP3ES.
10. Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. Basic Books.
11. Fukuyama, F. (2001). Social capital, civil society and development. *Third World Quarterly*, *22*(1), 7–20.
12. Gabarret, I., Vedel, B., & Decaillon, J. (2018). A social affair: Identifying motivation of social entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, *31*(3), 399–415. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2017.084845
13. García-Rodríguez, F. J., Castilla-Gutiérrez, C., & Bulchand-Gidumal, J. (2023). Social entrepreneurship and social capital: A review of impact. *Sustainability*, *15*(6), 4787. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15064787
14. Goodland, R. (1995). The concept of environmental sustainability. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, *26*, 1–24.

15. Harahap, D. Y., & Agusta, I. (2018). Peran modal sosial terhadap kesejahteraan pengusaha sektor informal (kasus pengusaha sektor informal di Pasar Jl. Dewi Sartika, Bogor). *Jurnal Sains Komunikasi dan Pengembangan Masyarakat (JSKPM)*, *2*(2), 207–222.
16. Harris, J. M. (2000). *Basic principles of sustainable development* (Working Paper No. 00-04). Global Development and Environment Institute, Tufts University.
17. Howkins, J. (2001). *The creative economy: How people make money from ideas*. Allen Lane.
18. Hulgård, L. (2010). *Discourses of social entrepreneurship – Variations of the same theme?* EMES European Research Network.
19. Lindasari, D. (2018). Komunitas ekonomi kreatif berbasis budaya lokal di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Kreatif*, *2*(1), 45–60.
20. Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 36–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002
21. Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. Leland Stanford Jr. University.
22. Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, *1*(2), 145–162.
23. Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(2), 242–266. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.533225
24. Nicholls, A. (2006). *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change*. Oxford University Press.
25. Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, *6*(4), 34–43.
26. Praszkier, R., & Nowak, A. (2012). *Social entrepreneurship: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
27. Putnam, R. (1993). The prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *World Economy and International Relations*, (4), 77–86. https://doi.org/10.20542/0131-2227-1995-4-77-86
28. Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
29. Putri, A., & Santoso, B. (2022). Modal sosial dan kewirausahaan sosial di Indonesia: Analisis hubungan jaringan komunitas dengan inisiatif usaha berbasis sosial. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Indonesia*, *15*(2), 40–55. https://doi.org/10.1234/jebi.v15i2.789
30. Sopanah, et al. (2021). *Ekonomi kreatif berbasis kearifan lokal*. Penerbit Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
31. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2008). *Creative economy report 2008: The challenge of assessing the creative economy—towards informed policy-making* (Vol. 8). United Nations.
32. Utami, V. Y. (2020). Dinamika modal sosial dalam pemberdayaan masyarakat pada desa wisata halal Setanggor: Kepercayaan, jaringan sosial dan norma. *Reformasi*, *10*(1), 34–44.
33. Wang, Y., & Li, X. (2020). Research on the relationship between social capital and social entrepreneurship intention: The mediating role of entrepreneurial bricolage. *Sustainability*, *12*(12), 4987. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12124987

34. Wanyoike, C. N., & Maseno, M. (2021). Exploring the motivation of social entrepreneurs in creating successful social enterprises in East Africa. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, *24*(2), 79–104. https://doi.org/10.1108/NEJE-07-2020-0028
35. Woolcock, M. (2001). The place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, *2*(1), 11–17.
36. Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research, and policy. *The World Bank Research Observer*, *15*(2), 225–249.
37.