
THE CONNECTION BETWEEN GOALS AND REWARDS IN A SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Supriyanto

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Sayyod Muhammad Alawi Al Maliki, Situbondo,
Indonesia

ben.supri@gmail.com

Fus Thaththul Nur Sasongko

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Al-Muntahy, Sampang, Indonesia
nsasongko74@gmail.com

Abstract

Social Entrepreneurship is a growing business model that addresses social and environmental issues through products and services. In Indonesia, the ecosystem supporting Social Entrepreneurship is expanding, but the lack of a unified definition and slow government recognition has led to varied practices and outcomes. This study aims to explore how Social Enterprises disclose their corporate identity and maintain accountability. Using Identity and Stakeholder Theory, the study examines five key identity aspects: mission, activity, governance, performance, and accountability. A multiple case study approach was applied to 10 Indonesian Social Enterprises chosen for their prominence and diversity. Data were gathered from official company websites, supported by interviews and CEO presentations from webinars in 2022 and 2023. Thematic analysis using NVivo software identified patterns across these identity aspects. The findings show that Social Enterprises prioritize social values like community development, empowerment, welfare, and sustainability over profit generation. Institutional commitment is reflected in impact reports, achievement profiles, SDG disclosures, and media coverage. However, financial performance is rarely disclosed, and accountability practices vary between formal impact reporting and informal stakeholder engagement. This study contributes by offering a framework for understanding how Social Enterprises disclose their identity and stay accountable. It also provides practical guidelines for policymakers and practitioners to strengthen the Social Entrepreneurship ecosystem in Indonesia. Future research should further explore the financial performance and long-term impact of Social Enterprises to balance social and economic goals.

Keywords: Goals, Rewards, Social Entrepreneurship

INTRODUCTION

Social enterprise is gaining popularity in Indonesia, as it has in other nations, as a means to make a positive influence through business. Despite this growing interest, there remains significant ambiguity surrounding the legal identity and operational framework of social enterprises in Indonesia. According to many sources (Doherty et al., 2014; Ebrahim et al., 2014; Grassl, 2012; Ridley-Duff, 2008), social enterprises are hybrid organizations that merge non-profit objectives with commercial business practices. Recognizing this evolving sector, the Indonesian government issued Presidential Regulation No. 2 of 2022 on the Development of National Entrepreneurship for 2021-2024. However, existing social enterprises have adopted diverse legal structures, including private companies, foundations, and cooperatives, without a unified legal personality. This regulatory gap creates inconsistencies in their operations and raises questions about their adherence to the criteria established by the regulation.

Table 1
Legal Structures of Social Enterprises in Indonesia

Legal Structure	Characteristics	Challenges
Private Companies	Profit-oriented with social objectives	Lack of clear social mission
Foundations	Non-profit with social impact goals	Limited revenue-generation
Cooperatives	Member-driven, collective benefit	Governance and efficiency issues

This study aims to address several key issues. First, there is a lack of in-depth research on the Indonesian context despite the sector's rapid growth. Estimates from the British Council (2020) indicate around 342,000 social enterprises in Indonesia, yet only 2,000 have received official recognition. This discrepancy underscores the need for further investigation into the actual practices and development of these organizations. Additionally, the absence of a singular definition and an accrediting body contributes to the sector's ambiguity, a situation not observed in Malaysia (Nadzri et al., 2021).

Moreover, social enterprises play a vital role in community development by addressing social, economic, and environmental issues through innovative and sustainable solutions (Altinay et al., 2016; Gidron and Monnickendam-Giv-on, 2017; Singgalen, 2022).

Understanding the distinct characteristics of social enterprises in Indonesia requires a robust theoretical framework. This study applies identity theory (Gesso, 2021) to explore how social enterprises transcend traditional entrepreneurial models and stakeholder theory (Freeman, 2015) to examine their interactions with diverse and sometimes conflicting stakeholder interests.

Despite the increasing visibility of social enterprises through online platforms and public engagements, no comparable studies have systematically examined their identities using publicly available data. To fill this gap, this research analyzes information from the websites and webinar presentations of ten prominent Indonesian social enterprises. These enterprises, selected for their combination of social goals and sound commercial operations, operate across diverse sectors, including education, creative economy, waste management, and tourism.

Table 2
Key Sectors and Activities of Selected Social Enterprises

Sector	Activities	Public Engagement
Education	Providing affordable educational access	Webinars, online courses
Creative Economy	Promoting local creative industries	Exhibitions, digital platforms
Waste Management	Implementing sustainable practices	Community outreach programs
Tourism	Developing eco-friendly tourism	Public awareness campaigns

This study's originality lies in its comprehensive exploration of social enterprise identity through the dual lenses of identity and stakeholder theory. By comparing social enterprises with traditional corporations and non-profits, it identifies distinctive attributes in purpose, operations, leadership, and metrics for success. Furthermore, this research evaluates how current practices align with the requirements of Presidential Decree No. 2 of 2022 and contributes to the development and legitimization of the sector in Indonesia.

The following sections outline the paper's structure: first, a definition and historical overview of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia; second, an analysis of current practices framed by identity and stakeholder theory; third, a presentation and discussion of findings;

and finally, the study's limitations and implications for future research on social enterprise in Indonesia.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Social Enterprise in Indonesia Conceptually and operationally, social enterprises are distinct. Although there is no universally accepted definition of a social enterprise, the practices surrounding these organizations have grown increasingly diverse over the years (Adam et al., 2016; Anastasiadis, 2016; Borzaga and Depedri, 2012; Claeyé, 2016; Cooney, 2011; Spear et al., 2009; Yu, 2011). In Indonesia, the ecosystem of social enterprises includes various stakeholders such as investors, educational and government institutions, advisors, and supporting organizations (ANGIN, 2019). However, different social enterprises interpret the business concept in varying ways, leading to inconsistent practices and definitions.

A social enterprise is typically defined as a business that uses market forces to address social or environmental issues or to provide essential services to those who cannot otherwise afford them (Alliance, 2018). In Indonesia, this definition is commonly adopted. Haryanti et al. (2020) outline five key criteria for a social enterprise: a social mission with measurable impact, an economically responsible model, member empowerment, reinvestment of a larger portion of profits into its mission, and a focus on sustainability. However, these standards are not fully aligned with the official recognition of social enterprises provided by Presidential Regulation No. 2 of 2022. This inconsistency calls for a clearer policy framework and a standardized definition to avoid fragmentation within the sector.

The following table compares the key characteristics of social enterprises based on different sources:

Table 3
Key Characteristics of Social Enterprises

Characteristics	Haryanti et al. (2020)	Presidential Regulation No. 2 of 2022
Social Mission	Measurable impact	Recognized but not clearly defined
Economic Responsibility	Emphasized	Implied but not detailed
Member Empowerment	Essential	Not explicitly mentioned

Characteristics	Haryanti et al. (2020)	Presidential Regulation No. 2 of 2022
Profit Reinvestment	Major portion reinvested	Not specified
Sustainability Focus	Core principle	Acknowledged but undefined

Social Enterprise and Web Disclosure Web disclosure plays a crucial role in ensuring transparency and accountability for social enterprises. Prior studies emphasize the importance of providing accurate, timely, and user-friendly information to stakeholders via websites (Abeysekera, 2020; Andrikopoulos et al., 2013; Blazquez et al., 2018; Everaert et al., 2019; Paraskevopoulou, 2015). For social enterprises, web disclosure enhances goal attainment and management reporting (Nadzri et al., 2021; Sean, 2017) by sharing various forms of information such as audio, video, photos, and presentations.

Despite its importance, the extent and quality of web disclosure by social enterprises in Indonesia remain underexplored. A comparative analysis between Indonesian social enterprises and those in other countries could shed light on best practices and areas for improvement. For instance, Basuony et al. (2020) argue that stakeholder involvement in data collection and decision-making strengthens informed consent and transparency. Therefore, Indonesian social enterprises should adopt more comprehensive web disclosure practices to enhance stakeholder engagement.

Entrepreneurial Identity of Social Enterprise Identity theory posits that society shapes the self, and the self shapes social behavior. This framework is crucial for understanding how social enterprises define their entrepreneurial identity. Wry and York (2017) suggest that expected behaviors are associated with specific identities, which align with the mission and activities of social enterprises. According to Gesso (2021), five pillars define the entrepreneurial identity of social enterprises: mission, activity, governance, performance, and accountability.

However, the application of these pillars in Indonesia requires further empirical investigation. The distinct cultural, economic, and regulatory environment in Indonesia influences how social enterprises establish and maintain their identity. For example, the emphasis on community involvement and social impact may shape governance and

performance metrics differently compared to Western contexts. Future research should explore how these pillars manifest in the Indonesian setting to provide a more nuanced understanding of social enterprise identity.

Stakeholders and Accountability The rapid evolution of social enterprises has attracted attention from various stakeholders, including government bodies, beneficiaries, customers, funders, partners, and local communities (Azzahra, 2022; Nadzri et al., 2021). Each stakeholder group has distinct needs and responsibilities, which shape the accountability framework of social enterprises.

Accountability and transparency are critical for balancing corporate and social objectives. Ebrahim et al. (2014) and Loan (2018) suggest that enhanced accountability mechanisms reduce conflicts of interest and ensure the achievement of both social and economic goals. However, the current literature lacks empirical data on how Indonesian social enterprises implement these mechanisms. Future studies should investigate the effectiveness of existing accountability practices and identify areas for improvement.

In conclusion, while the literature on social enterprises in Indonesia provides a foundational understanding, significant gaps remain. Greater theoretical depth, empirical evidence, and standardized definitions are needed to strengthen the sector's development and ensure alignment with global best practices.

RESEARCH METHOD

According to Presidential Regulation No. 2 of 2022 and Haryanti et al. (2020), this research takes a qualitative descriptive method to explore how current social entrepreneurship practices fulfill their identity. Despite the enormous and growing number of social companies, there is still a lack of clarity on their practice, particularly regarding their goals, operational strategies, and methods of measuring social impact. This research employs a multiple case study approach by examining ten social enterprises operating in the fields of education, tourism, agriculture, environmental management, and the creative economy. Based on their listings in the Social Enterprise directory (<https://usaha.social.com/-community/map/>),

these ten businesses were chosen. In addition to being listed in the directory, the selection process considered factors such as sectoral diversity, geographic representation, and the scale of their social impact. This approach ensured that the sample reflects a broad and comprehensive spectrum of social enterprises operating in education, tourism, agriculture, environmental management, and the creative economy. In 2022 and 2023, researchers attended several webinars to confirm that the selected company is still in operation and regularly refers to itself as a Social Enterprise. To enhance the reliability of this confirmation, researchers also cross-checked operational status through company reports, official documentation, and direct interviews with company representatives. There were three stages to the research process.

To gather first-hand knowledge on social entrepreneurship in Indonesia from founders, academics, and government officials, one of the researchers took part in a webinar series on the topic in 2022 and 2023. The next step was to evaluate the existing literature to compare current practices to the findings of earlier studies. We compiled the disclosure criteria that should be on the website and reflect the entrepreneurial character of the Social Enterprise based on the two preceding processes.

According to identity theory (Gesso, 2021), the following factors are considered: purpose, actions, leadership, results, and responsibility. The data is subsequently gathered from March to June 2023 through website disclosure, supplemented by direct data collection methods such as interviews and field observations to capture a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the social enterprise's identity and practice. Various social enterprises and groups based on identity criteria use Nvivo for data analysis, applying thematic analysis and coding techniques to identify patterns and commonalities across the collected data. To make sure this study wasn't biased, researchers also used triangulation of methodologies. We interviewed company owners and reviewed their webinar presentations in addition to the documentation studies available on the website (pictures, videos, informal narratives, and impact reports).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Social Over-Profit in the Mission Statement

As noted by Alter (2007), Dees (1998), and Hockerts (2010), the mission of a social enterprise distinguishes it from both non-profits and conventional businesses by addressing societal issues. A company's mission statement typically outlines its desired outcomes; for social enterprises, a well-defined mission is essential to guide their objectives and action plans. This study investigates whether the mission of social enterprises demonstrates their distinctiveness. The following analysis addresses this research question.

A company's values, vision, and mission are often discernible from its website. In this research, NVivo software was used to analyze recurring terms in the mission, vision, or value statements of social enterprises. Unlike conventional for-profit companies that prioritize shareholder value, social enterprises focus on generating societal value, aligning their community-oriented vision with their social mission. Nevertheless, not all social enterprises articulate clear and comprehensive visions, missions, and values. Some merely reference one or two elements without fully integrating all three.

In Indonesia, Presidential Regulation No. 2 of 2022 defines social enterprises as organizations supporting the government in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Regardless of their profit status, social enterprises reinvest their earnings to advance their social mission. Many social enterprises align their mission or vision with SDG achievement, as illustrated in the following examples.

One featured case study is a social enterprise based in Sumatra, renowned for its coastline tours, which attract thousands of surfers annually and significantly boost local state revenue. According to its website, the enterprise's mission is "Empowering rural communities through the implementation of responsible tourism." This aligns with several SDGs, including promoting decent livelihoods, fostering economic progress, and ensuring quality education for all.

Another example is an innovative Indonesian application dedicated to food rescue. This marketplace enables consumers to purchase surplus food from grocery stores or restaurants at a 50% discount. This initiative contributes to ending hunger, promoting responsible consumption and production, and addressing climate change. Additionally, a social enterprise focusing on empowering rural women through creative industry initiatives demonstrates a commitment to cultural promotion and welfare enhancement.

Data analysis using NVivo software identified common terms like empowerment, community, prosperity, contribution, and sustainability as central to these social enterprises' objectives. These values distinguish social enterprises from traditional for-profit businesses while also differentiating them from non-profits through their entrepreneurial approach to achieving social goals (Bradford et al., 2020; Alter, 2007; Wang, 2009). The sustainability of social enterprises arises from the interplay between financial resources and social impact, aligning with Presidential Regulation No. 2 of 2022, which emphasizes innovative business models driven by social ideals.

People, Planet, and Profit through Activities

Understanding social enterprise operations requires an examination of how their entrepreneurial activities create social impact. Unlike traditional non-profits, social enterprises leverage business activities as tools for social change. Alter (2007) categorizes social enterprises based on the integration of social programs and business operations, classifying them as mission-centric, mission-related, or mission-unrelated.

This study of 10 social enterprises reveals the balance between product or service sales and social impact. Websites often detail products, pricing, and production stories, frequently accompanied by images and videos illustrating the beneficiaries' experiences. This approach not only promotes transparency but also demonstrates how entrepreneurial efforts address social and environmental challenges (Gesso, 2021).

Findings indicate that these enterprises stay true to their mission, as evidenced by previous research (Chinchilla and Garcia, 2017; Hockerts, 2017; Mair and Noboa, 2006; Ruskin et al., 2016), which highlights the drive to solve social issues as the primary motivation

behind social enterprise formation. The integration of economic, social, and environmental considerations in their operations underscores their commitment to holistic impact.

For instance, one social enterprise's mission to improve marine ecosystems involves empowering coastal communities through education and economic initiatives. This alignment of entrepreneurial activities with social goals illustrates how social enterprises balance commercial success with societal contribution.

Multi-Stakeholder Governance

Governance within social enterprises reflects the interactions between various stakeholders, shaping responsibilities, rights, and obligations. Effective governance requires identifying and addressing stakeholder needs (Mason, 2009; Mason et al., 2007), which include service users, internal staff, local communities, government entities, investors, and business partners.

This research examines stakeholder disclosures on social enterprise websites, revealing diverse engagement. Leadership teams often include CEOs and co-founders with specific roles like Chief Marketing Officer (CMO) or Chief Community Development Officer (CCD). Staff recruitment and volunteer opportunities are frequently advertised, highlighting the importance of community participation.

One example involves a social enterprise seeking Middle Eastern migrant women as training instructors, demonstrating the role of empowerment through education. This aligns with Dewi et al. (2019), who emphasize volunteers' critical role in maintaining accountability and ensuring mission adherence.

Partnerships with private companies, public agencies, and certification bodies also play a crucial role. Collaborations with large businesses enhance commercial sustainability and align social enterprises with established operational standards, such as providing fair wages.

Accreditations like Halal and B Corp certifications further validate social enterprises' commitment to stakeholder welfare and sustainability. Research suggests that such certifications enhance stakeholder trust and encourage consumer support, fostering long-

term impact (Verhaar, 2023; Villela et al., 2021; Carvalho et al., 2022; Ferré-Cerdà et al., 2020; van Eck and Kelly, 2018).

Beneficiaries, as primary stakeholders, are integral to social enterprises' mission-driven models. Prioritizing beneficiaries through needs assessments and program design strengthens the relevance and effectiveness of social initiatives (Wellens and Jegers, 2014; Dewi et al., 2019; Hall and O'Dwyer, 2017).

Social Over Financial Performance

Social enterprises prioritize mission fulfillment over financial performance, distinguishing them from traditional businesses. Measuring success requires balancing social impact with economic sustainability (Austin et al., 2006). While commercial metrics like profitability and sales growth are standardized, social performance indicators are more context-specific.

This study analyzes financial performance through product availability, sales data, partnerships, certifications, and profit distribution. Transparent disclosure of these aspects enhances trust and long-term sustainability.

Social performance, reflected in community empowerment and impact, remains central to social enterprises' objectives. Website profiles showcasing achievements, volunteer initiatives, and stakeholder collaborations illustrate their commitment to societal well-being.

Striking a balance between social and financial goals is essential to avoid mission drift, where overemphasis on one aspect undermines the enterprise's identity (Ebrahim et al., 2014; Civera et al., 2020). As one social enterprise founder noted, maintaining this balance requires strategic decision-making and long-term vision.

Accountability Mechanisms

Accountability in social enterprises involves transparent performance disclosure to stakeholders at all organizational levels. Mechanisms include formal reporting, mission statements, and activity integration (Loan, 2018; Wang, 2009; Ab Samad et al., 2017; Bradford et al., 2018, 2020).

Interviews with social enterprise co-founders highlight accountability practices such as fair transaction rates, educational scholarships, and health initiatives. These commitments reflect the enterprise's dedication to its beneficiaries. As Haryanti et al. (2020) emphasize, transparency and responsibility underpin social enterprise operations. Financial audits and performance reports validate accountability, ensuring alignment with both social and business objectives.

CONCLUSION

Disclosure of corporate identification is central to this study's goal of describing Social Enterprise activity. Mission, activity, governance, performance, and accountability are the five aspects of identity that this study examines using the framework of identity and stakeholder theory. Except for reinvesting the profits into social activities that have not yet been disclosed, the existing ten social enterprise practices adhere to the characteristics outlined in Presidential Regulation No. 2 of 2022 and Haryanti et al. (2020).

All of the company's actions and duties are guided by its objective. Community, empowerment, welfare, and sustainability are more prominent in social enterprise missions compared to traditional venture business missions. Through the sale of goods and services derived from the firm's and third parties' empowerment initiatives, including but not limited to volunteer work and collaboration, the company is able to reveal its business activities. Beneficiaries, the board of directors, volunteers, and partners are just a few of the many stakeholders involved in corporate governance, which aims to accomplish the company's objective.

A company's social and business initiatives can be assessed with the use of performance measurement tools. A company's website may feature an accomplishment profile or an informative narrative dissertation with images and videos, both of which serve to demonstrate the social performance of the business. Standardized metrics, such as SROI (a performance metric typically utilized in firms with a social mission), nevertheless have room for improvement when it comes to financial success. Lastly, there is a lack of standards

when it comes to social enterprise accountability, which hinders organizations from translating best practices within. Stages of accountability have been implemented, and the organization has remained true to its objective.

REFERENCES

Ab. Samad, N. H., Arshad, R., Asat, S. H., and Kasim, N. (2017). Sustainability and Accountability of Social Enterprise. *Management and Accounting Review (MAR)*, 16(2), pp. 181-202. https://doi.org/10.24191/mar.v1_6i2.562

Abeysekera, I. (2020). Intangibles Disclosure on Entrepreneurial Small Businesses' Websites to Influence Stakeholders' Impressions. *Australian Accounting Review*, 30(1), pp. 22-32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/auar.12277>

Adam, S., Avilés, G., Ferrari, D., Amstutz, J., Crivelli, L., Enrico, C., and Zoebeli, D. (2016). Work Integration Social Enterprises in Switzerland. *Non-profit Policy Forum*, 7(4), pp. 509-539. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2016-0014>

Agrawal, A., Gandhi, P., and Khare, P. (2021). Women Empowerment Through Entrepreneurship: Case Study of a Social Entrepreneurial Intervention in Rural India. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-03-2021-2659>

Aida, I. and Hati, S. R. H. (2013). Social Entrepreneurship in Indonesia: Lessons from the Past. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 4(3), pp. 277-301. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2013.820778>

Alter, K. (2007). Social Enterprise Typology. *Virtue Ventures LLC*, 12(1), pp. 1-124.

Altinay, L., Sigala, M., and Waligo, V. (2016). Social Value Creation Through Tourism Enterprise. *Tourism Management*, 54, pp. 404–417. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.12.011>

Anastasiadis, M. (2016). Work Integration Social Enterprises in Austria – Characteristics, Evolution and Perspectives. *Non-profit Policy Forum*, 7(4), pp. 541-564. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2016-0008>

Andrikopoulos, A., Merika, A. A., Triantafyllou, A., and Merikas, A. G. (2013). Internet Disclosure and Corporate Performance: A Case Study of the International Shipping Industry. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 47, pp. 141-152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2012.10.016>

Angin. (2019). *52 Figures and Organizations Moving Social Entrepreneurship in Indonesia*. Retrieved from <https://www.angin.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/52-Figures-and-Organizations-Moving-Social-Entrepreneurship-in-Indonesia-v2.pdf>

Astrid, G. I. G. (2015). *Social Enterprises: Examining Accountability for Social and Financial Performance*. Queensland University of Technology.

Austin, J., Stevenson, H., and Wei Skillern, J. (2006). Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), pp. 1- 22.

Azzahra, B. (2022). ASEC (A Social Enterprises Connector): Platform Data Social Enterprises Terintegrasi sebagai Sarana Keberlanjutan Social Movement Pasca Covid 19. *Paper Presented at the Seminar Nasional Pari-wisata dan Kewirausahaan (SNPK)*.

Basuony, M. A., Mohamed, E. K., Elragal, A., and Hussainey, K. (2020). Big Data Analytics of Corporate Internet Disclosures. *Accounting Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.108/ARJ-09-2019-0165>

Blazquez, D., Domenech, J., and Debón, A. (2018). Do Corporate Websites' Changes Reflect Firms' Survival? *Online Information Review*.

Borzaga, C. and Depedri, C. (2012). The Emergence, Institutionalisation and Challenges of Social Enterprises: The Italian Experience. *Soci- al y Cooperativa*, 75, pp. 35-53.

Bradford, A., Luke, B., and Furneaux, C. (2018). Social Enterprise Accountability: Directions, Dominance, and Developments. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 14(2), pp. 156-179. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-03-2017-0018>.

Bradford, A., Luke, B., and Furneaux, C. (2020). Exploring Accountability in Social Enterprise: Priorities, Practicalities, and Legitimacy. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organizations*, 31(3), pp. 614-626. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-020-00215-8>

Carvalho, B., Wiek, A., and Ness, B. (2022). Can B Corp Certification Anchor Sustainability in SMEs? *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(1), pp. 293-304.

Chandra, Y. (2017). Social Entrepreneurship as Emancipatory Work. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(6), pp. 657-673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2017.08.004>

Chandra, Y. and Liang, S. (2017). Social Enterprise as a Mechanism of Youth Empowerment. *The Hong Kong Journal of Social Work*, 51 (01 & 02), pp. 115-144. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219246217000080>

Chedli, M. K. E. (2016). The Impact of Social Partnership on the Environment. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment, and People*, 5(4), pp. 6-23. <https://doi.org/10.26458/jedep.v5i4.510>

Chinchilla, A. and Garcia, M. (2017). Social Entrepreneurship Intention: Mindfulness Towards a Duality of Objectives. *Humanistic Management Journal*, 1(2), pp. 205-214.

Civera, C., Cortese, D., Mosca, F., and Murdock, A. (2020). Paradoxes and Strategies in Social Enterprises' Dual Logics Enactment: A csQCA between Italy and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Business Research*, 115, 334-347.

Claeyé, F. (2016). *Social Enterprise in South Africa: A Tentative Typology*.

Connolly, C. and Kelly, M. (2011). Understanding Accountability in Social Enterprise Organisations: A Framework. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 7(3), pp. 224-237. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17508611111182386>

Cooney, K. (2011). An Exploratory Study of Social Purpose Business Models in the United States. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(1), pp. 185-196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009351591>

Council, B. (2020). *Creative and Social Enterprise in Indonesia*. Retrieved from Indonesia.

Dees, J. G. (1998). Enterprising Non-profits: What do You do When Traditional Sources of Funding Fall Short. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(1), pp. 55-67.

Dees, J. G. (2003). Social Entrepreneurship is About Innovation and Impact, Not Income. *Social Edge*, pp. 1-4.

Desiana, P. M., Ma'arif, M. S., Puspitawati, H., Rachmawati, R., Prijadi, R., and Najib, M. (2022). Strategy for Sustainability of Social Enterprise in Indonesia: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *Sustainability*, 14 (3), pp. 1383.

Dewi, M. K., Manochin, M., and Belal, A. (2019). Marching with the Volunteers: Their Role and Impact on Beneficiary Accountability in an Indonesian NGO. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-10-2016-2727>

Doherty, B., Haugh, H., and Lyon, F. (2014). Social Enterprises as Hybrid Organizations: A Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(4), pp. 417-436.

Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., and Mair, J. (2014). The Governance of Social Enterprises: Mission Drift and Accountability Challenges in Hybrid Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 34, pp. 81-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2014.09.001>

Everaert, P., Bouten, L., and Baele, A. (2019). CSR Website Disclosure: The Influence of the Upper Echelons. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 32(2), pp. 421-455. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-03-2017-2882>

Ferguson, K. M. (2012). *Merging the Fields of Mental Health and Social Enterprise: Lessons from Abroad and Cumulative Findings from Research with Homeless Youths*. Vol. 48.

Ferré-Cerdà, L., Viana-Neves, O., Nawej, J. L., and Carlsson, M. (2020). *B Corp Certification - A Strategic Step Towards Sustainability?*

Filatova, U. (2020). Environmental Entrepreneurship as a Type of Social Entrepreneurship. *Paper Presented at the E3S Web of Conferences*.

Fotheringham, S. and Saunders, C. (2014). Social Enterprise as Poverty Reducing Strategy for Women. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 10(3), pp. 176-199. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-06-2013-0028>.

Freeman, R. E. (2015). Stakeholder Theory. *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*, pp. 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317>

Gesso, C. D. (2021). An Entrepreneurial Identity for Social Enterprise across the Institutional Approaches: From Mission to Accountability toward Sustainable Societal Development. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 15(1).

Gidron, B. and Monnickendam-Givon, Y. (2017). A Social Welfare Perspective of Market-Oriented Social Enterprises. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 26(2), pp. 127-140.

Grassl, W. (2012). Business Models of Social Enterprise: A Design Approach to Hybridity. *ACRN Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives*, 1(1), pp. 37-60.

Hall, M. and O'Dwyer, B. (2017). Accounting, Non-Governmental Organizations, and Civil Society: The Importance of Non-profit Organizations to Understanding Accounting, Organizations and Society. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 63, pp. 1-5.

Haryanti, D. M., Hati, S. R. H., and Anggriyani, D. S. (2020). *Profit untuk Misi Sosial*. Jakarta: DBS Foundation.

Hockerts, K. (2010). Social Entrepreneurship between Market and Mission. Hockerts, Kai. "Social Entrepreneurship between Market and Mission." *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 8(2010), pp. 177-198.

Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1), pp. 105-130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12171>.

Jones, T. M., Wicks, A. C., and Freeman, R. E. (2017). Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art. *The Blackwell Guide to Business Ethics*, pp. 17-37. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2010.495581>

Karamoy, H. (2017). Accessibility, Accountability and the Impact of Social Enterprise. *Journal of Life Economics*, 4, pp. 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.15637/jlecon.204>

Kim, M. J. (2018). A Study of the Economic and Social Performance of Social Enterprise. *The International Journal of Advanced Culture Technology*, 6(2), pp. 43-50.

Kusumasari, B. (2016). The Business Model of Social Entrepreneurship in Indonesia. *BISNIS and BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi*, 22(3), pp. 156-168.

Kusumastuti, R. and Juwono, V. (2022). Social Enterprise in Action: A Study of Indigenous Community-based Enterprise in Rural Areas to End Poverty in All its Form (Irodori Leaf-Business Kamikatsu, Japan and Ikat Woven-Business Pringgasela Lombok, Indonesia). *KnE Social Sciences*, pp. 424-431.

Kwong, C., Bhattarai, C. R., Bhandari, M. P., and Cheung, C. W. 2023. Does Social Performance contribute to the Economic Performance of Social Enterprises? The Role of Social Enterprise Reputation Building. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*.

Lee, R. L. and Blouin, M. C. (2019). Factors Affecting Web Disclosure Adoption in the Non-profit Sector. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 59(4), pp. 363-372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2017.1370988>

Loan, A. (2018). *Accountability in Social Enterprises Around the World*. Retrieved from <https://accountablenow.org/accountability-in-social-enterprises-around-the-world/>

Mair, J. and Noboa, E. (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship: How Intentions to Create a Social Venture are Formed Social Entrepreneurship*, pp. 121-135. Springer.

Maksum, I. R., Rahayu, A. Y. S., and Kusumawardhani, D. (2020). A Social Enterprise Approach to Empowering Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Indonesia. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(3), pp. 50. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6030050>

Mason, C. (2009). *Governance in Social Enterprises*.

Mason, C., Kirkbride, J., and Bryde, D. (2007). From Stakeholders to Institutions: The Changing Face of Social Enterprise Governance Theory. *Management Decision*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740710727296>

Molecke, G. and Pinkse, J. (2017). Accountability for Social Impact: A Bricolage Perspective on Impact Measurement in Social Enterprises. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(5), pp. 550-568.

Nadzri, F. A. A., Lokman, N., Yusuf, S. N. S., and Naharuddin, S. (2021). Accountability and Transparency of Accredited Social Enterprises in Malaysia: Website Disclosure Analysis. *Management and Accounting Review (MAR)*, 20(3), pp. 246-276.

Nair, R., Arshad, R., Muda, R., and Joharry, S. A. (2022). Web-Disclosure Practices for Transparency and the Sustainability of Non-Profit Organisations. *International Review on Public and Non-profit Marketing*, pp. 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-021-0 0330-2>

Paraskevopoulou, P. (2015). *Stakeholder Communication Through the Websites and Expression of Success*. (Master Thesis Master Thesis), Sewesh University of Agriculture Sciences. Retrieved from <http://stud.epsilon.slu.se>

Pinheiro, P., Daniel, A., and Moreira, A. (2021). Social Enterprise Performance: The Role of Market and Social Entrepreneurship Orientations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organizations*, 32(1), pp. 45-60.

PLUS. (2022). *Understanding the State and Profile of Social Enterprise in Indonesia*. Retrieved from Jakarta: <https://usahasosial.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Understanding-the-State-and-Profile-of-Social-Enterprise-in-Indonesia-2022-Platform-Usaha-Sosial-PLUS.pdf>

Pratono, A. H., Pramudija, P., and Sutanti, A. (2016). *Social Enterprise in Indonesia: Emerging Models Under Transition Government*.

Puspadewi, I., Soetjipto, B. W., Wahyuni, S., and Wijayanto, S. H. (2019). Managing Paradox for the Sustainability of Social Enterprises: An Empirical Study of Forestry Community Cooperatives in Indonesia. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 10(2), pp. 177-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1541008>

Qastharin, A. R. and Vanourek, G. (2020). Understanding the Business Model of Social Enterprise: Case Study of Indonesia Mengajar. *The Future Opportunities and Challenges of Business in Digital Era*, 4.0, pp. 239-243.

Ridley-Duff, R. (2008). Social Enterprise as a Socially Rational Business. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 14(5), pp. 291-312. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550810897669>

Rostiani, R., Paramita, W., Audita, H., Virgosita, R., Budiarto, T., and Purnomo, B. (2015). Understanding Social Enterprises in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jieb.6356>.

Rostiani, R., Paramita, W., Audita, H., Virgosita, R., Budiarto, T., and Purnomo, B. R. (2014). Understanding Social Enterprises in Indonesia: Drivers and Challenges. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 29(2).

Ruskin, J., Seymour, R. G., and Webster, C. M. (2016). Why Create Value for Others? An Exploration of Social Entrepreneurial Motives. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54 (4), pp. 1015-1037. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12229>

Sanzo-Pérez, M. J., Rey-García, M., and Álvarez-González, L. I. (2022). Downward Account-
The Connection between Goals ...

ability to Beneficiaries in Social Enterprises: Do Partnerships with Non-profits Boost It without Undermining Accountability to Other Stakeholders? *Review of Managerial Science*, 16(5), pp. 1533-1560. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-021-00485-6>

Sean, L. J. (2017). *Collaborations, Board Independence and Website Social Impact Disclosures: A Study of Social Enterprises*. Queensland University of Technology.

Selsky, J. W. and Parker, B. (2005). Cross-Sector Partnerships to Address Social Issues: Challenges to Theory and Practice. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), pp. 849-873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279601>

Singgalen, Y. A. (2022). Peran Perusahaan Sosial dalam Pemberdayaan Masyarakat untuk Pemhidupan Berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 11(2), pp. 257-268.

Spear, R., Cornforth, C., and Aiken, M. (2009). The Governance Challenges of Social Enterprises: Evidence from a UK Empirical Study. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 80(2), pp. 247-273. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2009.00386.x>

Utami, W., Nugroho, L., and Nemoto, M. (2020). The Conception and Practices of Social Enterprise between Indonesia and South Korea. *Al Farabi Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(4), pp. 41-48.

van Eck, W. and Kelly, D. (2018). *The Sustainability Journey: An Exploration into Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises' Quest for Legitimacy: The B Corp Case*.

Verhaar, F. D. R. (2023). *Sustainability as a Strategy: The B-Corp Certification's Effect on Consumers' Willingness to Pay*.

Vidal, I. (2014). *Multi-Stakeholder Governance in Social Enterprise Social Enterprise and the Third Sector*, pp. 192-202. Routledge.

Villela, M., Bulgacov, S., and Morgan, G. (2021). B Corp Certification and Its Impact on Organizations Over Time. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 170, pp. 343-357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04372-9>

Wang, W. J. (2009). *Accountability in Social Enterprises: An Analytical Framework*. The University of Pittsburgh's Johnson Institute for Responsible Leadership Working Papers.

Wangsirilert, C. and Simon, L. (2017). *How Large-Scale Companies and Social Enterprises Improve the Sustainability of Their Partnership? (Master of Science)*, KTH Industrial Engineering and Management Stockholm, Sweden.

Wellens, L. and Jegers, M. (2014). Beneficiary Participation as an Instrument of Downward Accountability: A Multiple Case Study. *European Management Journal*, 32(6), pp. 938-949. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2014.03.004>

Wry, T. and York, J. G. (2017). An Identity-Based Approach to Social Enterprise. *Academy of The Connection between Goals ...*

Management Review, 42(3), pp. 437-460. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0 506>.

Yu, X. (2011). *Social Enterprise in China: Driving Forces, Development Patterns and Legal Framework*. Vol. 7. Emerald.