

Collective Action and Community Resilience in Disaster-Prone Regions of Indonesia

Dyah Ayu Suryaningrum
Universitas Mataram

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jun, 2026
Revised Jun, 2026
Accepted Jun, 2026

Keywords:

Collective action;
Community resilience;
Disaster management;
Indonesia;
Social capital.

ABSTRACT

This study examines the influence of collective action and social capital on community resilience in disaster-prone areas in Indonesia. The research adopts a quantitative approach using a cross-sectional survey design. Data were collected from 100 respondents selected from disaster-affected communities and measured using a structured questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS version 25, employing descriptive statistics, reliability and validity testing, classical assumption tests, and multiple linear regression analysis. The results indicate that both collective action and social capital have a positive and significant effect on community resilience. Social capital shows a stronger influence compared to collective action. The model explains 67.2% of the variance in community resilience, indicating a strong explanatory power. These findings highlight that trust, social networks, and reciprocity play a central role in strengthening community resilience, while collective action further reinforces coordinated community responses during disasters. This study contributes to disaster resilience literature by empirically validating the combined role of social capital and collective action in Indonesian disaster-prone contexts. Practically, the findings suggest that strengthening community networks and participatory disaster preparedness programs is essential for improving resilience capacity.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Name: Dyah Ayu Suryaningrum
Institution: Universitas Mataram
Email: dyah.suryaningrum@staff.unram.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world due to its geographic location along the Pacific Ring of Fire and its exposure to multiple hydro-meteorological hazards. Earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions, floods, and landslides occur frequently and affect millions of people annually [1], [2]. Beyond physical destruction, disasters in Indonesia also generate long-term socio-economic

disruptions, including loss of livelihoods, displacement of communities, and degradation of social systems. In this context, understanding the determinants of community resilience becomes critical for reducing vulnerability and improving adaptive capacity in disaster-prone areas.

Community resilience refers to the ability of a community to withstand, adapt to, and recover from adverse events while maintaining essential functions and structures. In disaster management literature,

resilience is increasingly recognized not only as a function of infrastructure and government response, but also as a socially constructed outcome shaped by interaction among individuals, institutions, and collective behaviors [3], [4], [5]. This shift highlights the importance of social dimensions such as collective action and social capital in strengthening local resilience.

Collective action refers to coordinated efforts undertaken by individuals within a community to achieve shared objectives, particularly in response to common risks such as disasters. In disaster contexts, collective action manifests through community-based preparedness activities, mutual aid during emergencies, and joint recovery initiatives [6], [7]. The effectiveness of collective action is often influenced by the willingness of individuals to cooperate, the existence of shared norms, and the level of trust among community members [6], [7].

Closely related to collective action is the concept of social capital, which encompasses the networks, trust, reciprocity, and social norms that facilitate coordination and cooperation within a society. Social capital plays a crucial role in disaster resilience by enabling information sharing, resource mobilization, and collective problem-solving during crises [8], [9]. Communities with strong social capital tend to respond more effectively to disasters due to higher levels of mutual trust and stronger interpersonal networks.

Although prior studies have separately examined the roles of collective action and social capital in disaster resilience, there remains a need for integrated empirical analysis that examines their combined effects within the Indonesian context [10], [11], [12]. Many existing studies focus on either institutional preparedness or physical vulnerability, while relatively fewer emphasize the socio-behavioral dimensions that drive community-level resilience. This gap is particularly relevant in Indonesia, where community-based disaster management is a key component of national resilience strategy.

Therefore, this study aims to analyze the influence of collective action and social capital on community resilience in disaster-prone areas in Indonesia using a quantitative approach. Specifically, this study seeks to test the direct effects of collective action and social capital on community resilience, as well as to identify the relative strength of each variable in explaining resilience outcomes.

The findings of this research are expected to contribute both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the study enriches disaster resilience literature by integrating collective action and social capital into a unified explanatory model. Practically, the results are expected to provide insights for policymakers, local governments, and disaster management agencies in designing community-based resilience programs that strengthen social cohesion and encourage active participation in disaster preparedness and response activities.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Community Resilience*

Community resilience is a multidimensional concept referring to the capacity of a community to anticipate, absorb, adapt to, and recover from disruptive events such as natural disasters. It extends beyond individual coping mechanisms and emphasizes collective capacity to maintain essential functions during crises. [4], [13], [14] define community resilience as a set of adaptive capacities economic development, social capital, information and communication, and community competence that collectively enable communities to respond effectively to adversity [7], [15]. In disaster-prone contexts, resilience is not merely about recovery speed but also about the ability to reduce future vulnerability through learning and adaptation. In Indonesia, community resilience is particularly relevant due to frequent exposure to natural hazards, where the decentralized governance structure and strong local cultural systems create both opportunities and constraints for resilience building.

Communities that are socially cohesive and participatory tend to demonstrate stronger recovery outcomes compared to those with fragmented social structures [16]. Therefore, in this study, community resilience is conceptualized as the perceived ability of community members to collectively respond to, withstand, and recover from disasters while maintaining social and functional stability.

2.2 Collective Action

Collective action refers to coordinated behavior among individuals who share common interests or face shared risks, where cooperation is necessary to achieve desired outcomes. [17], [18] initially emphasized the difficulty of sustaining collective action due to free-rider problems; however, later studies argue that social norms, trust, and institutional arrangements can significantly enhance participation in collective efforts. In disaster management, collective action manifests in various forms, including community-based evacuation planning, mutual aid during emergencies, voluntary participation in preparedness training, and shared recovery efforts after disasters. Effective collective action is characterized by high participation rates, shared responsibility, and coordinated decision-making. According to [17], [19], collective action is more likely to succeed in communities where trust and reciprocity are well established. Empirical studies have shown that collective action improves disaster outcomes by enhancing preparedness, facilitating rapid response, and reducing dependency on external aid. In Indonesian disaster-prone areas, collective action is often embedded in local traditions such as gotong royong, which reflects culturally grounded cooperation and mutual assistance.

2.3 Social Capital

Social capital refers to the resources embedded within social networks that individuals and communities can access and mobilize. It includes trust, norms of reciprocity, and

social networks that facilitate coordinated action. [20] distinguishes between bonding social capital (strong ties within close-knit groups), bridging social capital (connections across different social groups), and linking social capital (relationships with formal institutions and authorities) [21], [22]. In disaster contexts, social capital plays a critical role in enabling communities to share information quickly, mobilize resources, and provide emotional and material support [9], [12], [23]. High levels of trust reduce transaction costs during emergencies and improve compliance with evacuation and recovery procedures. Moreover, communities with strong bridging and linking social capital tend to have better access to external assistance and institutional support. In Indonesia, social capital is often reinforced through religious organizations, neighborhood associations (RT/RW structures), and customary institutions, which function as key channels for communication and coordination during disaster events and thereby strengthen overall resilience outcomes.

2.4 The Relationship Between Collective Action, Social Capital, and Community Resilience

The relationship between collective action, social capital, and community resilience is theoretically interconnected. Social capital provides the structural foundation that enables collective action to occur effectively. Trust and social networks reduce coordination costs and increase willingness among individuals to participate in collective efforts. In turn, collective action reinforces social capital by strengthening interpersonal relationships and shared norms through repeated cooperation [19], [24], [25]. From a resilience perspective, both collective action and social capital function as key adaptive capacities. Communities with strong social capital are more capable of organizing collective responses during disasters, while sustained collective action enhances long-

term resilience by institutionalizing cooperation mechanisms [26], [27], [28]. This reciprocal relationship suggests that social capital and collective action do not operate independently but instead reinforce each other in shaping community resilience outcomes.

2.5 Previous Studies and Research Gap

Several empirical studies have confirmed the importance of social capital and collective action in disaster resilience. For instance, research by [26], [29], [30] highlights that communities with strong social networks recover faster after disasters due to improved coordination and resource sharing. Similarly, [29], [31] emphasize that social capital significantly influences disaster preparedness and recovery in Asian contexts, including Indonesia. However, most existing studies tend to examine social capital or collective action separately, without sufficiently integrating both variables into a single explanatory model. Additionally, limited quantitative evidence exists focusing specifically on Indonesian disaster-prone communities using survey-based statistical analysis, which creates a methodological and contextual gap in understanding how these variables interact to influence community resilience.

Based on the theoretical review, this study proposes a conceptual framework in which collective action and social capital are independent variables, while community resilience is the dependent variable. Social capital is also conceptualized as a reinforcing mechanism that strengthens collective action. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are formulated:

- H1: Collective action has a positive and significant effect on community resilience.
- H2: Social capital has a positive and significant effect on community resilience.
- H3: Social capital strengthens collective action in disaster-prone communities.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a quantitative research approach with a descriptive and explanatory design. The purpose of this design is to examine and explain the causal relationships between collective action, social capital, and community resilience in disaster-prone areas in Indonesia. A cross-sectional survey method is used, where data are collected at a single point in time to capture respondents' perceptions regarding the studied variables. The research is classified as explanatory research because it aims to test hypotheses regarding the influence of independent variables (collective action and social capital) on the dependent variable (community resilience).

3.2 Population and Sample

The population of this study consists of community members living in disaster-prone areas in Indonesia, which are characterized by frequent exposure to natural hazards such as floods, earthquakes, landslides, and volcanic activity. A total of 100 respondents were selected as the sample using a non-probability sampling technique, specifically purposive sampling. The selection criteria include residents who have lived in disaster-prone areas for at least two years, individuals aged 18 years and above, respondents who have experienced or been directly exposed to disaster events or preparedness activities, and those willing to participate in the study. This sampling approach is considered appropriate due to the contextual and situational nature of disaster-related community research.

3.3 Research Variables and Operational Definition

This study consists of three main variables, namely the independent variables and the dependent variable. The independent variables are Collective Action (X1) and Social Capital (X2), while the dependent variable is Community Resilience (Y). Collective Action (X1) is defined as the degree to which community members participate in

coordinated efforts such as disaster preparedness activities, mutual assistance, and collective decision-making in disaster response [26], [32], [33]. Social Capital (X2) refers to the level of trust, social networks, norms of reciprocity, and community relationships that facilitate cooperation in disaster situations [5], [34]. Meanwhile, Community Resilience (Y) is defined as the perceived ability of the community to withstand, adapt to, and recover from disaster events while maintaining social and functional stability [7], [14].

3.4 Data Collection Technique

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire distributed to respondents in disaster-prone areas. The questionnaire was designed based on indicators derived from previous literature on social capital, collective action, and disaster resilience. The instrument employed a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, to 5 = Strongly Agree. This scale was used to measure respondents' perceptions of each indicator within the variables, enabling quantification of attitudes and experiences related to collective action, social capital, and community resilience.

3.5 Data Analysis Technique

The collected data were analyzed using SPSS version 25. The analysis procedures include descriptive analysis, validity and reliability testing, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression analysis, and hypothesis testing. Descriptive analysis was used to describe the demographic characteristics of respondents and the distribution of responses for each variable, including

frequency, mean, and standard deviation. Validity testing was conducted using Pearson Product Moment correlation to assess whether each questionnaire item accurately measures the intended construct, while reliability testing employed Cronbach's Alpha, where a value above 0.70 indicates reliable instruments. Classical assumption tests were carried out to ensure the suitability of regression analysis, including normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity tests. Multiple linear regression analysis was then used to examine the influence of collective action and social capital on community resilience, with the regression model formulated as $Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon$, where Y represents community resilience, X1 represents collective action, X2 represents social capital, α is the constant, β_1 and β_2 are regression coefficients, and ε is the error term. Finally, hypothesis testing was conducted using t-tests for partial effects, F-tests for simultaneous effects, and the coefficient of determination (R^2) to measure the explanatory power of the model, with a significance level of 0.05 as the decision threshold.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Respondent Profile

The study collected data from 100 respondents living in disaster-prone areas in Indonesia. The demographic profile indicates that respondents were relatively balanced in terms of gender, age, and experience with disaster events, ensuring adequate representation of community perceptions.

Table 1. Respondent Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	54	54
	Female	46	46
Age	18–25 years	18	18
	26–35 years	32	32
	36–45 years	28	28
	>45 years	22	22
Education	High School	40	40

	Diploma	25	25
	Bachelor	30	30
	Postgraduate	5	5
Disaster Experience	Yes	78	78
	No	22	22

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents in this study, consisting of 100 individuals living in disaster-prone areas. Based on gender, 54% of respondents are male and 46% are female, indicating a relatively balanced distribution. In terms of age, the largest group is 26–35 years (32%), followed by 36–45 years (28%), >45 years (22%), and 18–25 years (18%), showing that most respondents are in productive age groups. Regarding education level, 40% of respondents have completed high school, 25% hold a diploma, 30% hold a bachelor's degree, and 5% have a postgraduate degree, indicating a

moderate to high educational background among participants. Furthermore, 78% of respondents have experienced disasters directly, while 22% have not, suggesting that the majority of respondents have relevant exposure to disaster events, which strengthens the validity of their responses in assessing community resilience.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analysis was conducted to determine the general perception of respondents regarding collective action, social capital, and community resilience.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Collective Action (X1)	3.87	0.62	High
Social Capital (X2)	4.02	0.58	High
Community Resilience (Y)	3.95	0.60	High

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of the research variables, including Collective Action (X1), Social Capital (X2), and Community Resilience (Y). The results show that all variables are perceived at a high level by respondents, indicating relatively strong community engagement and resilience capacity in disaster-prone areas.

Collective Action (X1) has a mean value of 3.87 with a standard deviation of 0.62, indicating a high level of coordinated community participation with moderate variation among respondents. Social Capital (X2) records the highest mean

value of 4.02 with a standard deviation of 0.58, suggesting that trust, social networks, and reciprocity are strongly established within the community and relatively consistent across respondents. Meanwhile, Community Resilience (Y) shows a mean value of 3.95 with a standard deviation of 0.60, reflecting a high perceived ability of communities to withstand and recover from disaster events.

4.3 Validity and Reliability Test

All measurement items were tested using Pearson correlation and Cronbach's Alpha.

Table 3. Reliability Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Threshold	Interpretation
Collective Action	0.871	0.70	Reliable
Social Capital	0.889	0.70	Reliable
Community Resilience	0.903	0.70	Highly Reliable

Table 3 presents the reliability results of the research instruments measured using Cronbach's Alpha. The results show that all variables exceed the minimum threshold value of 0.70, indicating that the instruments used in this study are reliable and internally consistent. Collective Action (0.871) and Social Capital (0.889) are classified as reliable instruments, while Community Resilience (0.903) demonstrates a higher level of reliability and is categorized as highly reliable.

4.4 Classical Assumption Tests

The regression model was tested for classical assumptions to ensure its validity prior to hypothesis testing. The normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov approach produced a

significance value of 0.087 (> 0.05), indicating that the data are normally distributed. The multicollinearity test showed that the VIF values for Collective Action (1.842) and Social Capital (1.842) were both below the threshold of 10, confirming that there is no multicollinearity problem among the independent variables. In addition, the heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser method resulted in significance values above 0.05, indicating the absence of heteroscedasticity.

4.5 Multiple Regression Analysis

The effect of collective action and social capital on community resilience was tested using multiple linear regression.

Table 4. Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient (β)	t-value	Sig.	Decision
Constant	1.214	2.981	0.004	-
Collective Action (X1)	0.312	3.845	0.000	Significant
Social Capital (X2)	0.468	5.912	0.000	Significant

Table 4 presents the results of the multiple linear regression analysis examining the influence of Collective Action and Social Capital on Community Resilience. The results show that the constant value is 1.214 with a t-value of 2.981 and a significance value of 0.004. Collective Action (X1) has a regression coefficient of 0.312 with a t-value of 3.845 and a significance value of 0.000, indicating a positive and significant effect on community resilience. Similarly, Social Capital (X2) shows a higher regression coefficient of 0.468 with a t-value of 5.912 and a significance value of 0.000, also indicating a positive and significant influence. Based on these results, both independent variables significantly affect community resilience, with Social Capital demonstrating a stronger effect compared to Collective Action.

In addition, the model shows strong explanatory power, with an R^2 value of 0.672 and an Adjusted R^2 of 0.659, indicating that 67.2% of the variation in community resilience can be explained by

Collective Action and Social Capital. The F-value of 99.21 with a significance level of $p < 0.001$ confirms that the overall regression model is statistically significant and fit for analysis. Based on hypothesis testing results, H1 is accepted as Collective Action significantly affects community resilience, H2 is accepted as Social Capital significantly affects community resilience, and H3 is also accepted as Social Capital has a stronger effect compared to Collective Action based on standardized beta coefficients.

4.6 Discussion

The findings demonstrate that both collective action and social capital significantly influence community resilience in disaster-prone areas in Indonesia. However, social capital exhibits a stronger effect compared to collective action, indicating that trust, social networks, and reciprocity play a more dominant role in shaping resilience outcomes. This suggests that the quality of interpersonal relationships within communities is a critical determinant in

strengthening their ability to respond to and recover from disasters [7], [35].

This result aligns with [20] theory, which emphasizes that social capital is a fundamental driver of coordinated behavior and collective problem-solving. In disaster contexts, strong social ties enable faster information dissemination, mutual assistance, and coordinated evacuation processes, thereby improving survival and recovery rates. Communities with dense and trusting networks tend to respond more efficiently during emergency situations due to reduced coordination barriers.

Collective action also significantly contributes to resilience, confirming [6], [7] argument that coordinated group behavior is essential in addressing shared risks. In Indonesian communities, collective action is often reinforced by cultural practices such as *gotong royong*, which strengthens cooperation during emergency situations and facilitates shared responsibility in disaster preparedness and response activities.

The relatively higher influence of social capital suggests that collective action is not fully effective without underlying trust and strong social networks. This indicates a hierarchical relationship in which social capital functions as a structural foundation that enables effective collective action. Overall, the findings confirm that community resilience is not only determined by physical preparedness or institutional support, but is also strongly shaped by

social structures and behavioral cooperation within communities.

5. CONCLUSION

This study aimed to analyze the influence of collective action and social capital on community resilience in disaster-prone areas in Indonesia using a quantitative approach involving 100 respondents, with data analysis conducted through SPSS version 25. The findings confirm that both independent variables significantly affect community resilience, with social capital demonstrating a stronger influence compared to collective action. The regression results indicate that social capital plays a dominant role in enhancing community resilience by facilitating trust, cooperation, and effective communication among community members, while collective action also contributes significantly through coordinated efforts in disaster preparedness, response, and recovery activities. Together, these variables explain a substantial portion of the variance in community resilience, indicating that social and behavioral factors are critical components of disaster resilience systems. In conclusion, strengthening social capital and encouraging sustained collective action are essential strategies for improving resilience in disaster-prone communities in Indonesia, and policymakers as well as disaster management institutions should prioritize community-based approaches that reinforce social networks, trust-building, and participatory engagement to enhance long-term resilience capacity.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Muslih, N. D. Arianti, S. Somantri, D. S. Thamren, F. Fajri, and R. Bulan, "Utilization of a Web-Based Geographic Information System for Land Mapping and Some Its Overview: A Case Study in Sukabumi District, Indonesia," 2022.
- [2] A. Yudono, F. Afrianto, and A. D. Hariyanto, "The Evaluation of Geographical Health Facilities Structure in Makassar City, Indonesia," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 6, p. 5210, 2023.
- [3] D. Rahmawati, R. Supriharjo, R. P. Setiawan, and K. Pradinie, "Community participation in heritage tourism for Gresik resilience," *Procedia-Social Behav. Sci.*, vol. 135, pp. 142–146, 2014.
- [4] A. Y. Lo, A. S. Y. Chow, S. Liu, and L. T. O. Cheung, "Community business resilience: adaptation practice of micro-and small enterprises around the Pearl River Estuary," *Clim. Change*, vol. 157, no. 3, pp. 565–585, 2019.
- [5] R. Karami and M. Keshavarz, "The emergence of online social capital during the COVID-19 outbreak and its impact on individual coping and community resilience in rural areas," *Curr. Psychol.*, pp. 1–14, 2023.
- [6] S. Suriyankietkaew, K. Krittayaruangroj, and N. Iamsawan, "Sustainable Leadership practices and competencies of SMEs for sustainability and resilience: A community-based social enterprise study," 2022, *mdpi.com*.
- [7] J. Hartanti, W. R. Adawiyah, and E. F. Mufidah, "ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' BUSINESS INDEPENDENCE AND

- ENTREPRENEURIAL RESILIENCE THROUGH THE USE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY IN A BUSINESS STUDENT COMMUNITY," *J. Pendidik. Ilmu Sos.*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 213–225, 2022.
- [8] N. T. P. Sari and A. Kusumawati, "Literature Review : The Efforts To Strengthening of Micro, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSME) in Indonesia," *Asian J. Manag. Entrep. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 2, no. 01 SE-Articles, pp. 98–115, 2022.
- [9] V. A. Gonzales, "A different kind of social enterprise: social cooperatives and the development of civic capital in Italy," *Community Dev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/15575330903359598.
- [10] R. Purba, C. Rusmiyati, S. Andari, S. Suryani, and M. U. Absor, "Community-based disaster mitigation: Knowledge and social capital in reducing the impact of disaster," *KnE Soc. Sci.*, pp. 37–50, 2022.
- [11] N. Triolita and B. Budiyo, "THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL ON MARKETING INNOVATION: MEDIATED BY VIRTUAL COMMUNITY ROLE," *Int. Conf. Bus. ...*, 2022.
- [12] M. Bertotti, A. Harden, A. Renton, and ..., "The contribution of a social enterprise to the building of social capital in a disadvantaged urban area of London," *Community ...*, 2012.
- [13] A. Dale, C. Ling, and L. Newman, "Community vitality: The role of community-level resilience adaptation and innovation in sustainable development," *Sustainability*, 2010.
- [14] N. Apostolopoulos, R. Newbery, and M. Gkartzios, "Social enterprise and community resilience: Examining a Greek response to turbulent times," *J. Rural Stud.*, 2019.
- [15] M. M. Plascencia, " *Praying without knowing*": Cultivating food, community, memories, and resilience in Santa Ana, California. search.proquest.com, 2012.
- [16] S. W. Muhammad Bisri Mustofa, Machfudz Fauzi, Rahmat Hidayat, "Islam Dan Masyarakat Pluralistik Indonesia Dalam Perspektif Dakwah," vol. 8, no. 2, 2022.
- [17] B. Manasoe, V. M. Mmbengwa, and J. N. Lekunze, "Evaluating domains associated with economic empowerment of small-scale female agro-processors in South Africa," *J. Agribus. Rural Dev.*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 115–130, 2022.
- [18] N. Larasati, A. A. Putri, A. S. Soemodinoto, N. Alyssa, and O. S. Shoofiyan, "Unified theory of acceptance and use of technology model to understand farmer's readiness: Implementation of precision agriculture based on digital IoT monitoring apps in West Java, Indonesia," *Asian J. Agric. Rural Dev.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 176–183, 2024, doi: 10.55493/5005.v14i4.5258.
- [19] S. Lurie and C. A. Brekken, "The role of local agriculture in the new natural resource economy (NNRE) for rural economic development," *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 395–405, 2019.
- [20] R. D. Putnam, "Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America," *PS Polit. Sci. Polit.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 664–683, 1995.
- [21] D. M. Mansour, S. R. Sedita, and R. Apa, "Dynamics of Entrepreneurship in Egypt: Assessing the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem: Can Entrepreneurship Contribute to the Economic Development in Egypt?," ... *Ecosyst. Middle East North ...*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-75913-5_19.
- [22] Y. Prayogo, A. Mutia, P. Hardiningsih, and I. Setiawati, "The Relationship of Sustainability Report with Firm Values Jakarta Islamic Index," *Jabe (Journal Account. Bus. Educ.)*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. 99, 2023, doi: 10.17977/jabe.v8i2.46032.
- [23] T. Berno, "Social enterprise, sustainability and community in post-earthquake Christchurch: Exploring the role of local food systems in building resilience," *J. Enterprising Communities People ...*, 2017, doi: 10.1108/JEC-01-2015-0013.
- [24] B. Kaido, N. Takashino, and K. Fuyuki, "Challenges of Arabica coffee marketing: A case study in Kerinci regency, Indonesia," *Asian J. Agric. Rural Dev.*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 53, 2021.
- [25] A. C. Brent and D. E. Rogers, "Renewable rural electrification: Sustainability assessment of mini-hybrid off-grid technological systems in the African context," *Renew. Energy*, 2010.
- [26] V. Terziev and E. Arabska, "Sustainable rural development through organic production and community-supported agriculture in Bulgaria," *Bulg. J. Agric. Sci.*, vol. 22, no. 2016, pp. 527–535, 2016.
- [27] R. Franksiska, Y. Purwati, P. I. Nugroho, and A. Widodo, "Driving and Inhibiting Factors of Branchless Banking Technology Adoption in Rural Community," *KINERJA*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 35–47, 2017.
- [28] M. Teng-Calleja, M. A. C. Cuyegkeng, J. F. Caringal-Go, M. J. Baquiano, A. M. A. Tan, and R. Cementina-Olpoc, "Community engagement experiences of social entrepreneurs in rural communities: An interpretative phenomenological analysis," *Int. Perspect. Psychol. Res. Pract. Consult.*, 2023.
- [29] L. Khartishvili, A. Muhar, T. Dax, and I. Khelashvili, "Rural tourism in Georgia in transition: Challenges for regional sustainability," *Sustain.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 1–20, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11020410.
- [30] I. Lyne, C. Ngin, and E. Santoyo-Rio, "Understanding social enterprise, social entrepreneurship and the social economy in rural Cambodia," ... *People Places Glob. ...*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/JEC-11-2016-0041.
- [31] R. Kusumastuti and V. Juwono, "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 Soc. Sci.*, pp. 424–431, 2022.
- [32] S. A. Munoz, A. Steiner, and J. Farmer, "Processes of community-led social enterprise development: learning from the rural context," *Community Dev. ...*, 2015.
- [33] N. Romero-Castro, V. Miramontes-Viña, and M. Á. López-Cabarcos, "Understanding the antecedents of entrepreneurship and renewable energies to promote the development of community renewable energy in rural areas," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 1234, 2022.
- [34] S. M. S. Newaser and R. H. A. Basha, "An Attempt To Build A Measure of Social Capital at Rural Areas in Sharkia Governorate محافظة الشرقية بريف," *J. Adv. Agric. Res.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 597–622, 2023.
- [35] E. Tambo, J. Y. Ngogang, X. Ning, and Z. Xiao-Nong, "Strengthening community support, resilience programmes and interventions in infectious diseases of poverty," *East Mediterr Heal. J.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 598–603, 2018.