

POLITICAL ECONOMY FACTORS AFFECTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN EASTERN INDONESIA

Aswin Baharuddin, Universitas Hasanuddin
Nandito Oktaviano Guntur, Universitas Hasanuddin
Burhanuddin, Universitas Hasanuddin
Munjin Syafik Asyari, Universitas Hasanuddin
Adelita Lubis, Universitas Fajar
Mia Aulina Lubis, Universitas Sumatera Utara

ABSTRACT

There was a significant increase in the social entrepreneurship business unit. Globally, the data show that countries are already moving and benefiting from the rise of social entrepreneurship in their countries. This trend is also confirmed at the level of the Southeast Asia Region which shows that. ASEAN even has a specific program in the development of this social entrepreneurship. In line with these global and regional developments, Indonesia also has great potential in the development of social entrepreneurship. Previous research has projected that 1.5 percent of the total entrepreneurs in Indonesia can be classified as social entrepreneurs. From the British Council's research, it was found that the geographical distribution of social entrepreneurship business units in Indonesia still accumulates on the island of Java. This is in accordance with the larger data context which shows that the concentration of the Indonesian economy is still concentrated on the island of Java. Based on this background, this study aims to map social entrepreneur actors in South Sulawesi. Furthermore, this study aims to identify development strategies and international networks of social entrepreneurship business units in South Sulawesi. The research will be carried out by combining two approaches, namely qualitative and quantitative. Data was collected by means of literature review, questionnaires, in-depth interviews and Focused Group Discussions (FGD). Once collected, the data will be classified based on the formulation of the research problem to be analyzed and drawn conclusions. This research finds that historically, Social Entrepreneurship has developed since the 20th century and has undergone changes in every government regime. This study also finds that the dynamics of the development of social entrepreneurship in eastern Indonesia is driven by the intention to solve public problems that have not been well covered by the government. Furthermore, the development of social entrepreneurship in eastern Indonesia is carried out by building relationships with government and non-government parties from within and outside the country.

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurs, Eastern Indonesia, Political Economy, South Sulawesi.

INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship can be defined as a business whose main motivation is a social or environmental mission and reinvests most of its profits for that social mission (British Council, 2018). Social entrepreneurs have a mission to solve social problems and provide a measurable positive impact on the welfare of society and the environment through planning, development, and empowerment as well as replanting most of the profits to support the mission. As a new discourse, social entrepreneurship is a form of initiative that occurs in the third sector of the economy (Defourny, 2014; Dobeles, 2009). The development of social entrepreneurship globally has received the attention of researchers since three decades ago. As a discourse, researchers are interested in the business model, the intentions of the activists and their implications for the beneficiary community (Kerlin, 2010).

According to research by the Reuters Foundation (2016), there are 15 countries that have benefited greatly from the development of social entrepreneurship. These countries include the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, Singapore, Israel, Chile, South Korea, Hong Kong, Malaysia, France, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, Colombia and India. These countries have formulated government support for social entrepreneurship such as personnel recruitment requirements, living wages, facilitating investment, public understanding of the need for social change and facilitating the growth of this economic sector.

Among the Asian countries that create the best conditions for the development of social entrepreneurship are Singapore, South Korea, Hong Kong, Malaysia. These countries have provided maximum support for the solution of social problems through a social entrepreneurship approach (Sengupta & Sahay 2017; Thomson Reuters Foundation, 2016). In the Southeast Asia Region, efforts to develop social entrepreneurship in Asean Region organizations can be seen through the ASEAN Social Enterprise Structuring Guide. Of course, this global and regional trend is important for Indonesia to respond to so that it can benefit from these problems.

Social entrepreneurship is a concern of many countries because of its huge potential benefits. The potential benefits in question include employment, encouraging youth and millennial generation innovation, promoting gender equality and environmental rehabilitation. In Indonesia, research by the British Council (2018) provides an estimate of the number of social enterprises reaching 342,025. The number comes from four categories, namely Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), NGOs (Local and National) and Cooperatives. More complete data can be seen in the following Table 1.

Category	Total	Prevalence	Number of Social Entrepreneurs
Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs),	21.979.261	1.5%	329,689
NGOs (National)	655	3%	20
NGOs (Local)	1.638	46%	753
Cooperatives Unit	150.789	7,7%	11.563
Total			342.025

Source: British Council, 2018.

The projection above then became the basis for the British Council to conduct further research and map the respondents of social entrepreneurs in Indonesia. The majority of respondents came from

West Java (23%), Jakarta (22%), and East Java (14%). A similar trend occurs in MSMEs-according to BPS data, Central Java, East Java and West Java are the provinces with the largest number of MSMEs. This data confirms that economic activity is highly concentrated in Java, where as much as 58% of the country's economic activity takes place (BPS, 2018).

The data above shows that social entrepreneurship activities in Eastern Indonesia, including South Sulawesi, have not been well and comprehensively photographed. Based on this background, this article specifically aims as follows. First, political economy factors in the history of the development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. Second, the dynamics of the development of social entrepreneurship in Eastern Indonesia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many studies related to social entrepreneurship in Indonesia have been done before. These studies can be classified into 4 categories. The first category tries to trace historically the substance of the idea and development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. Researches in this category (Idris & Hijrah Hati, 2013; Abbas, 2015; Aljunied, 2011; Asad, 2016). found that Indonesia has a long history of social entrepreneurship. The term Social Entrepreneurship in Indonesia was first introduced by Ashoka in Kartini School, Sjarikat Dagang Islam, and Muhammadiyah are some examples of social entrepreneurship business units in the early 20th century.

The second category is research that looks at the relationship between government policies and the development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. This research was conducted by (Pratono et al., 2016) with the title Social Enterprise in Indonesia: Emerging Models under a Transition Government. The third category is looking at the potential of the Indonesian market in absorbing products and services from social entrepreneurs. Indonesia also presents special opportunities for social entrepreneurs, as the Global Survey of Corporate Social Responsibility found that 64% of Indonesian consumers are willing to pay extra for brands that are committed to making a positive or social and environmental impact (Nielsen, 2014).

The fourth category is research that tries to map and categorize the business model of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. Previous research on social entrepreneurs in Indonesia can be found in *The Art of Sustainable Giving*, which identified 454 existing social entrepreneurs and more than 1,400 aspiring social entrepreneurs (Yulius et al., 2015). Research with a similar objective was also conducted by the British Council (2018 and 2020) which found the main support organizations - accelerators, incubators, ecosystem builders, capacity builders - we were able to identify around 2,000 social entrepreneurs and aspiring social entrepreneurs in Indonesia.

In addition to mapping, several studies have tried to identify and propose a model of the characteristics of social entrepreneurs. A study entitled *A Typology of Social Venture Business Model Configurations* by Margiono et al. (2017) found that the first characteristic of social entrepreneurship is to focus on a social mission, namely the creation of public and social value. This characteristic eliminates commercial enterprises that operate on the principle of profit maximization. The second characteristic addresses corporate ownership, which states that social enterprises embrace private ownership, which eliminates charities, community groups, voluntary organizations, and other entities that cannot distribute their profits freely. The third characteristic, social entrepreneurs obtain funding from commercial activities, government grants, and private funding such as venture capital, investors and loans.

Social Venture Business Model for Transforming Non-Profit Organizations: Typology-Driven Theorizing (2018) Margiono argues that there are four types of social entrepreneurs classified based on funding sources and external controls. There are two types of funding sources: public funding that comes from grants and government spending, and private funding that comes from other funding sources such as venture capital, investors, and loans. There are also two types of external control: public control such as public oversight and supervision by the government, and private control which is completely controlled by market mechanisms such as competitiveness.

The four types of social entrepreneurs include: entrepreneurs who receive public funding with public control (type I), social entrepreneurs that receive private funding with public control (type II), social entrepreneurs that receive private funding with private control (type III), and social enterprises that receives public funding with private control (type IV). While other types allow social entrepreneurs to distribute profits, type I has fewer options for distributing profits due to the choice of legal entity form, most of which are foundations or NGOs. Since these organizations receive most of their funds from public sources such as grants, they do not have the right to distribute their profits, even though they are conducting business activities.

The study of *The Social Enterprise in Indonesia* by (Pratono et al., 2016), suggests a typology of four models of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. The first typology includes social entrepreneurs emerging from non-profit organizations (NPOs), which they call Entrepreneurial NPOs. These social enterprises integrate their social missions and economic activities to ensure their sustainability, and adopt a self-governing and self-governing model. Second, social enterprises that arise from mutual interest organizations are called Social Cooperatives. These social enterprises rely on their own resources in terms of finance and management. Third, Community Development Enterprises are social entrepreneurs who seek to solve problems in their communities and focus on increasing the allocation of local resources for the benefit of the community. They bring together social and economic activities and manage the community with the help of local leaders. Lastly, Social Business seeks to achieve social impact by focusing on financial sustainability. They run their organizations as business professionals.

From the elaboration above, we can find that there has been no research specifically for the locus of Eastern Indonesia. There are no findings that explain the typical models and characteristics of social entrepreneurs in Eastern Indonesia. Based on this argument, this research tries to make Eastern Indonesia a new locus of research related to social entrepreneurship.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHOD

The research carried out in in South Sulawesi. The stages of the research are as follows. The first stage is a Literature Review, Online Search, and Interview with the Key Informants. After that, in the second stage, the preparation of interview guidelines, questionnaires and other research instruments will be carried out. In the third stage, surveys, in-depth interviews and FGDs will be conducted on business actors and local governments at the research locations that have been determined. In the third stage, quantitative and qualitative data will be grouped and processed. In the fourth stage, interviews with experts and analysis of research data will be conducted. After that, in the fifth stage, data analysis and research conclusions will be drawn. The research questions posed in this article are:

1. What political economic factors (national and global) influence the development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia?
2. How are the dynamics of the development of social entrepreneurship in eastern Indonesia?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

National and Global Political Economy Factors in the History of the Development of Social Entrepreneurship in Indonesia

This section will explain the dynamics of the global and national political economy that affect the development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia with a historical review. It can be classified into two parts. First, about the history of the development and influence of changes in the political regime on social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. Second, the dynamics of the global political economy that affects the massive emergence of social entrepreneurship. Further elaboration of the two points will be presented in the following paragraphs.

First, questioning the history and influence of changes in the political regime in Indonesia on the development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. The first thing that will be presented is the history of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. The historical track record of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia is closely related to social movements (Idris & Hijrah Hati, 2013). At least, according to historical records, the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship has emerged since the colonial period. Organizations such as the Kartini School, Sarekat Islam, Nahdathul Ulama, and Taman Siswa are organizations that, despite having a political vision and a spirit of national liberation, have the characteristics of social entrepreneurship (Idris & Hijrah Hati, 2013). To ensure the continuity of an effective social movement, the nationalistic organization financed itself.

In addition, in 1954, a women's cooperative was founded by Mursia Zaarfil (Simmonds, 2017). At the beginning of its formation, this was a form of solidarity and assistance to the women's economy at that time. Over time, this cooperative is growing and has its own type of business. Efforts to help each other are also still going on to this day. On the other hand, in 1970, a missionary named Father Albrecht founded CU (Credit Union) which aims to eradicate poverty (Simmonds, 2017). Furthermore, in 1983, the Ashoka Foundation was established in Indonesia. According to records, the organization was the first organization to introduce the term social entrepreneurship or social entrepreneurship. (Simmonds, 2017; Stoffers et al., 2018). At this point, based on a brief historical presentation, at least it can be seen that Indonesia has a history of social entrepreneurship that has its roots in colonial times. Generally, these social entrepreneurs try to carry out certain social movements and are economically independent. One of the typical actors also here refers to religious actors.

Meanwhile, what needs to be explained is how the changes in the regime's political economy situation affect social entrepreneurs in Indonesia. This will lead to the time span of the late 1800s colonial period up to the Jokowi era. Everything will be explained briefly. During the colonial period, the existing political regimes tended to be colonialist and highly exploitative. The exploitation of indigenous workers is massive and the pressure on indigenous Indonesians is also multi-layered. This raises resistance that manifests in the economic empowerment of indigenous people (Idris & Hijrah Hati, 2013). Along with that, the ethical policy of the Netherlands produced several results, among which was the thought of independence. This vision began to develop and became a pattern of social movements in the colonial period. The social entrepreneurship movement at that time was also to make the movement economically

independent (Idris & Hijrah Hati, 2013). In addition, religious actors also play an important role at this time.

Meanwhile, during the Soekarno administration, the regime at that time was filled with instability. However, the vision of political economy policy at that time was economically independent. Hatta as vice president at that time initiated the cooperative as a model of the people's economy. Therefore, the state encouraged the creation of cooperatives at that time. This later became one of the characteristics of social entrepreneurship that developed during the Soekarno government (Pratono et al., 2016). On the other hand, during the Soeharto era, the role of the state in various social, economic and political activities was very strong. The state even took part in the formation of civil organizations (Pratono et al., 2016).

Furthermore, post-reform, a more democratic regime began to emerge in Indonesia. Civil society got a lot of freedom and civil organizations began to appear everywhere (Pratono et al., 2016). In addition, the current of modernization also influences the management of the philanthropic type of social entrepreneur. Dompot Dhuafa, which used to be a zakat institution only at that time, later became a civil organization characterized by social entrepreneurship with modern management (Nurdin, 2013). On the other hand, funding for NGOs also began to decrease and stimulated the change of NGOs into pure social entrepreneurs (Sudarsono, 2016). However, the social entrepreneurship ecosystem did not develop massively in the early 2000s.

During the Jokowi government, discourse on entrepreneurship was circulated massively. This is accompanied by a strong narrative of economic nationalism (Aspinall, 2015). At the same time, many specializations are given to the entrepreneurship sector, including providing incentives and facilitating the flow of bureaucracy in preparing certain administrations (Nurshafira & Alvian, 2019). All of these have one goal, namely to encourage national economic growth. At this point, Alvian and Nurshafira's study shows interesting results. According to them, because of Jokowi's political economy policies, social entrepreneurs in Indonesia are more likely to make social entrepreneurs more economic in color (Nurshafira & Alvian, 2019). In this sense, social entrepreneurship plays more of a role in the improvement and growth of the national economy. One of them is creating jobs. For example, this is supported by data from the British Council which states that the biggest positive impact of social entrepreneurship today is the provision of labor (Council, 2018). In connection with all of these things, then, in relation to the influence of changes in the political regime, the influence of the state's political economy policies has a very large influence on the development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. The political economy policies of a regime can influence the development of social entrepreneurship in a certain period.

Second, questioning the dynamics of the global political economy that affects the development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. For starters, what must be underlined here is that the dynamics of the global political economy does not only affect social entrepreneurs in Indonesia, but also affects the whole world. Jannel Kerlin's study (Kerlin, 2010) on the global phenomenon of social entrepreneurship shows that a major factor in the emergence of social entrepreneurship is the lack of the state's role in social policy towards its people. Since the enactment of the Washington Consensus, perceptions of the role of the state in social policy have changed (Eds, 2012; Fardig & Hakansson, 2014). This is measured by social policies and government spending to solve social problems such as poverty, health, and education.

In the context of Indonesia, the Washington Consensus has a significant influence on Indonesia's political economy policies. This influence can be seen directly from the economic reform policies implemented by Indonesia. In the 1980s, driven by the fall in global recession oil

prices, Indonesia's oil production and agricultural sectors experienced a decline (Booth & McCawley, 1981). Economic policy reform at that time thus had one main goal, namely diversification of government revenues, especially in manufacturing and agriculture (Resosudarmo & Kuncoro, 2006). Overall, this goal was achieved through efforts to facilitate exports by deregulating and incentivizing exports (Booth & McCawley, 1981). Meanwhile, in fiscal policy, spending on education, health, and wages was cut and diverted to investment (until now, although government spending on education, health, and wages continues to increase, the percentage of spending in this sector is only one percent) (Resosudarmo & Kuncoro, 2006; Sumarto, 2017; Umar, 2021). At this point, Indonesia's social policies are primarily geared towards supporting economic growth. In the conception of a welfare system designed by the state, this phenomenon is a productive welfare system (Sumarto, 2017; Tan, et al., 2019; Tiwari, et al., 2017). In such a context, the role of the state in social issues seems insignificant and stimulates further initiation of the growth of the third sector in which social entrepreneurship is growing (Defourny, 2014; Radyati, 2018).

Apart from this, technological advances and trends in the movement of civil society in the Asian region also occur in Indonesia (Defourny & Kim, 2011; Fardig & Hakansson, 2014). Technological advances, as explained in the background section, have made the connection between global communities even more massive (Fardig & Hakansson, 2014). With this technology, the connection between the global communities is getting more massive. This connectedness makes it easier for many individuals to realize social problems, work together, and interact (Eds, 2012). At this point, the global social entrepreneurship network is the result of this phenomenon. In the context of Indonesia itself, the massive use of technology in Indonesia's economic policies and activities was applied massively in the early 1990s (Booth & McCawley, 1981). Meanwhile, the collapse of Suharto's authoritarian regime which was hit by the global economic crisis forced the Indonesian government to make many systemic political economic policy changes (Resosudarmo & Kuncoro, 2006). There has been a strong movement of decentralization and democratization globally and domestically in Indonesia. This provides fresh air for the civil society movement and the very fast growth of the third sector (Radyati, 2018). At the same time, the growth of social entrepreneurship has also begun to gain significant growth.

The Dynamics of the Development of Social Entrepreneurship In Eastern Indonesia: A Description of Actors, Strategies and Influencing Factors

This section will explain the dynamics of the development of social entrepreneurship in Eastern Indonesia, more specifically South Sulawesi. The social entrepreneurship units studied were Ritma Green, MallSampah, and Kopitani. The dynamics in question include Actor Explanations, Social Entrepreneurial Models, Social Entrepreneurial Business Development Strategies and Factors that support and hinder the development of social entrepreneurs.

First, social entrepreneur Ritma Green. Ritma Green is a social entrepreneur with an operations center in Bone. Bone is one of the districts in South Sulawesi. This social entrepreneur wants to build the integration of agriculture and animal husbandry. More specifically, this leads to the production of biogas, which converts livestock manure into fertilizer or fuel for cooking. The establishment of Ritma Green is closely related to the background of its founder who is a former NGO activist in the field of community empowerment and agriculture. This experience prompted him to take up a similar sector. The forerunner to the establishment of Ritma Green stems from his involvement with the British Council in social

entrepreneurship competitions. Starting informally in 2010, Ritma Green then got a collaboration with a biogas partner from the Netherlands who gave him training in biogas production. In 2013, with the encouragement of the government, ritma green formed itself into CV. Since 2013, Ritma Green has been formally established

Ritma Green has two work patterns that are fluid. This means that there are no fixed working hours like a very formal office work pattern. The first work pattern of this entrepreneur is technical work. This work is related to the construction of biogas installations. The second pattern of work is non-technical work. This includes management work such as managing the media and conducting collaborations. This work pattern comes from what problems and what kind of problem solving is used by green rhythm. In addition, this work pattern also tries to counteract the lack of permanent workers in this social enterprise.

Ritma Green business development and financing strategy. Ritma Green is a social entrepreneur whose work is trying to build biogas installations. In the process, this installation costs around 20 million. The main funding for the installation of this installation comes from government assistance and private assistance. The founder himself admits that the use of personal funds is rarely used. This government assistance is closely related to the vision of the provincial and district governments seeking to strengthen the agricultural sector. Meanwhile, private assistance comes from within and outside the country. This assistance is sometimes in the form of training as well as grants. In the process, to reduce dependence on funding from the government, Ritma Green is also temporarily starting a coffee business as an additional cost. If previously the portion of government assistance was 80 percent, then it will be reduced to only 40 percent.

Inhibiting and supporting factors of Ritma Green. The main inhibiting factor of green rhythmic movements is the internal performance of this entrepreneur. The absence of permanent employees and temporary green rhythm work makes the presence of permanent employees less and less. Meanwhile, in the process of developing a green rhythm as a social entrepreneur, the role of government and private assistance also plays a significant role. In the context of the pandemic, the main supporting factor, namely government assistance, has decreased significantly. Usually there is an allocation of certain BUMD to agricultural development for South Sulawesi farmers. Rhythm Green usually gets some help from this. Since the pandemic took place, the allocation of funds for this matter has been diverted for handling the pandemic.

Second, social entrepreneurship Mallsampah. This social entrepreneur operates in Makassar city and has a vision to build effective waste management and recycling in Makassar. The establishment of Mallsampah is closely related to community problems experienced directly by its founder. Seeing the accumulated waste and the lack of management carried out by the government sparked the awareness of the founders to solve the problem. The founder of Mallsampah is a graduate of the Indonesian Muslim University Makassar. His education fields are law and environmental law. This educational background at least has had its own influence on this pioneering social entrepreneurship. In the beginning, in 2015 Mallsampah was just a community. It then developed into a PT in 2017. Then, in 2019 it began to develop its own application. The development of the waste mall initially started from participating in the PKM (Student Creativity Program) on campus. Can survive due to further innovation of the people who work internally in it.

Meanwhile, the work pattern of the waste mall is quite different from some other entrepreneurs. However, just like the previous social entrepreneurs, the work pattern is also quite fluid. There is no office work time that must be strictly followed. Furthermore, Mallsampah uses

a start-up work model that focuses primarily on app usage. Because generally the main problem that needs to be solved is the understanding of the community in managing waste, so much of his work leads to campaigns about the importance of managing waste. In addition, the waste mall also initiated the formation of a volunteer community that has similar environmental concerns. This community then became one of the spearheads in the environmental care campaign from Mallsampah.

Strategy for business development and financing for waste malls. The waste mall business development strategy leads to collaboration with local collectors/scavengers as well as companies that want their commodity production to be recycled. From this collaboration, Mallsampah can support and carry out its social entrepreneurship work. In addition, cooperation with shops that have a vision of recycling waste is also one of the specific strategies in developing the waste mall business.

The inhibiting and supporting factors of Mallsampah. The main inhibiting factor for any waste mall work is the public's understanding of the management of recyclable waste. There are still many people who do not know how household waste can be managed and then recycled again. Meanwhile, the main supporting factor for the movement of the waste mall is the internal performance of the waste mall itself. During the pandemic, the main inhibiting factor in solving the waste mall problem is increasing. In many ways, household waste is increasing because activities at home are also increasing. This grows and is not accompanied by knowledge and public awareness of recycling waste management.

Third, the Kopitani social entrepreneurship. This entrepreneur operates in Makassar and has a vision of empowering farmers. More specifically, this entrepreneurial vision is to buy the same as helping farmers. In other words, the ultimate goal is to manage the distribution of coffee sales directly from farmers. Meanwhile, the establishment of Kopitani is closely related to the economic and social motives of its founder. On the one hand, the founder saw a problem with the distribution of coffee sales from the farmers. On the other hand, coffee is a commodity whose consumption will continue to increase in the future. Kopitani itself is here to help farmers as well as profit from the sale of the coffee. The founder of this social entrepreneur is a Communication graduate from the Muhammadiyah University of North Maluku. Before establishing this social entrepreneur, the founder was in the formal world of work. There he prepared the capital to build this social entrepreneur.

The establishment of Kopitani initially led to the assistance of farmers in several areas such as Toraja and Enrekang. This happened in 2017 to 2018. The year 2017 itself was the beginning of the establishment of this entrepreneur. In the process, due to difficult access to assistance, this form of assistance was later changed to a marketplace. The focus of social entrepreneurship is towards Eastern Indonesia. One of the reasons is because the opportunities for this business in Eastern Indonesia have not been widely exploited. Furthermore, Kopitani has a work pattern that is closely related to the work of being a coffee distributor. In this regard, media work, management work, promotion, and publications emerged. From work patterns like this, the Kopitani social entrepreneur model is a marketplace. However, in the process of working, these roles are sometimes held by only one person. This is a logical consequence of the lack of internal workers of this social entrepreneur. In addition, this social entrepreneur has also developed a franchise work pattern that facilitates the establishment of a coffee shop opening business.

The Kopitan business development strategy generally leads to an effective distribution of coffee. Some coffee farmers who managed to connect with him then got coffee distribution from

Kopitani. In the process, Kopitani also makes a new business development strategy that leads to a franchise business. Kopitani provides outlets and various Kopitani products for sellers who are interested in opening a coffee business. In addition, there is also coffee making training for each newly opened franchise. Apart from these three things, of these three social entrepreneurs, the only social entrepreneurs that are directly related to foreign partners are green rhythms. This relationship led to training provided by several overseas partners such as the British Council and also Hypos. Each of these two partners has a field of work and concern for the field of social entrepreneurship (British Council) as well as biogas development (Hypos).

Inhibiting and supporting factors for the development of Kopitani. The main obstacle to the work of Kopitani is the issue of funds. This funding has a major impact on franchise development and the purchase of coffee products from farmers. Meanwhile, the main supporting factor for this Kopitani is the coffee commodity that will continue to be consumed. During the pandemic, the decline in coffee consumption from cafes has fallen considerably. This also affects the demand for cooperation with the Kopitani franchise. Apart from all the things that have been discussed previously, there are also interesting points that need to be raised. This is about the possibility of turning social entrepreneurship into a pure business. Interviews with Rhythm Green underscore this vulnerability. To simply seek profit from business is very possible from these social entrepreneurship movements. In the context of this research, one of the social entrepreneurs also even shows a tendency to be purely economic. The social entrepreneur in question is a Kopitani. The ultimate goal of each of these social entrepreneurship movements has even led to the pursuit of profit alone. Helping farmers and making certain donations is only a side effect. The two facts that have been put forward at least have shown the vulnerability of social entrepreneurs to become businesses with a profit orientation.

From the various explanations that have been presented, there are several conclusions regarding the actors and models of social entrepreneurship in South Sulawesi. First, about the actors. The average actor involved in social entrepreneurship has a qualified education, concern for social problems, and certain innovations related to the problem to be solved. Furthermore, all the founders are also men. Second, about the social entrepreneurship model in South Sulawesi. This research shows that this model of social entrepreneurship is very dependent on social problems and how the solutions are carried out by the social entrepreneurs. In addition, all social entrepreneurs have a fluid work pattern. In connection with this conclusion, it can also be seen that the location of the operation also affects what problems are attempted to be solved.

From the aspect of development strategy, these three social entrepreneurs also began to develop their form of social entrepreneurship in the form of PT. This is closely related to the ease of obtaining funds from investors if their form of social entrepreneurship is in the form of PT. Based on the explanation that has been proposed, it can be seen that the business development and financing strategies of each social entrepreneur vary. Everything comes from the goals and what social problems the social entrepreneur is trying to solve. Furthermore, up to this point, the business development of the three social entrepreneurs has not yet reached the international level.

CONCLUSSION

This study finds that historically, Social Entrepreneurship has developed in Indonesia before the independence period. Social entrepreneurship in Indonesia undergoes changes in every government regime. This study also finds that the dynamics of the development of social

entrepreneurship in eastern Indonesia is driven by the intention to solve public problems that have not been well covered by the government. Furthermore, the development of social entrepreneurship in eastern Indonesia is carried out by building local and international networks with both government and non-government parties.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, A. (2015). Muhammadiyah is encouraged to develop more social works. *Republika*, 28.
- Aljunied, S.M. (2011). The other Muhammadiyah movement: Singapore 1958–2008, *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 42(2), 281-302.
- Asad, M. (2016) Factors influencing social entrepreneurship and its impact on society. India: University of Central Punjab, 33.
- Aspinall, E. (2015). The new nationalism in Indonesia, Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies. *Wiley*, 72–82.
- Booth, A., & McCawley, P. (Eds.). (1981). The Indonesian economy during the Soeharto era. *Oxford University Press*, 39(2), 329.
- Council, B. (2018). Building an inclusive and creative economy Creative. Jakarta.
- Defourny, J. (2014). From third sector to social enterprise, The Emergence of Social Enterprise, 1–18.
- Defourny, J., & Kim, S.Y. (2011). Emerging models of social enterprise in Eastern Asia: a cross country analysis. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 7(1), 86-111.
- Dobele, L. (2009). Influencing factors of social entrepreneurship in Latvia, *Journal of Economics*, 101–107.
- Eds, K.E. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business, Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business.
- Färdig, K., & Håkansson, M. (2014). The internationalization of social enterprises: Mapping patterns in the internationalization process of social entrepreneurs, 65.
- Idris, A., & Hijrah Hati, R. (2013). Social entrepreneurship in Indonesia: Lessons from the past. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 4(3), 277-301.
- Kerlin, J.A. (2010). A comparative analysis of the global emergence of social enterprise, *Voluntas*, 21(2), 162–179.
- Nurdin, A. (2013). The transformation of Dompot Dhuafa from the Amil Zakat Institution to a Social-Humanitarian Institution. *Buletin Al-Turas*, 19(2), 345-368.
- Nurshafira, T., & Alvian, R.A. (2019). Political-economy of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia: A Polanyian Approach. *Journal of Social and Political Sciences*, 22(2), 144-157.
- Pratono, A.H., Pramudija, P., & Sutanti, A. (2019). Social enterprise in Indonesia: Emerging models under transition government. *In Social Enterprise in Asia*, 79-96.
- Radyati, M.R.N. (2018) Third sector organisation governance in Indonesia : Regulations, Initiatives, and Models,” in *Comparative Third Sector Governance: Lesson from Asia*, 265–288.
- Resosudarmo, B.P., & Kuncoro, A. (2006). The political economy of Indonesian economic reforms: 1983–2000. *Oxford development studies*, 34(3), 341-355.
- Simmonds, M.R.N.R.T. (2017). Social enterprises in Indonesia (country report). Jakarta. Available at: http://rub.ruc.dk/_rub/summa/save_mendeley.php?id=pure_ddfmxid:c7957850-d0b2-11dc-b6fc-000ea68e967b.
- Stoffers, J., Gunawan, A., & Kleefstra, A. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship, An International Perspective. *Open Journal of Sciences*, 6(1), 342–356.
- Sudarsono, K. (2015). The transformation of non-governmental organizations towards social entrepreneurship: A case study of the ayofest film community. *Ultimart: Journal of Visual Communication*, 8(2), 53-63.
- Sumarto, M. (2017). Welfare regime change in developing countries: Evidence from Indonesia. *Social Policy & Administration*, 51(6), 940-959.
- Tan, L.P., Le, A.N.H., & Xuan, L.P. (2019). A Systematic literature review on social entrepreneurial intention A systematic literature review on social, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1–16.
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A.K., & Tikoria, J. (2017) An empirical analysis of the factors affecting social entrepreneurial intentions, *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 7(9), 1–25.
- Umar, A.R.M. (2021). Southeast Asia: Small states, Strong Societies, weak regional cooperation, in *Small States, Strong Societies: Essays on Covid-19 Responses in Southeast Asia*, 1–14.