

Integration of Social Entrepreneurship and Corporate Social Responsibility through the Triple Helix Framework in DTSEN-Based Poverty Alleviation Policies: Systematic Literature Review and Research Agenda

Nayla Khairunnisa Mutaqien^{1*}, Harry Z. Soeratin²

^{1,2}Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jakarta

*E-mail Correspondence: 2410112207@mahasiswa.upnvj.ac.id, harrysoeratin@upnvj.ac.id

Abstract—This study aims to identify research directions and theoretical contributions regarding the integration of Social Entrepreneurship (SocEn) and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) through the Triple Helix framework in the context of poverty alleviation policies based on Integrated Social Welfare Data (DTSEN) as regulated in Presidential Instruction No. 4 of 2025. Through systematic analysis of 15 journals (5 Scopus, 2 Sinta 2, 2 Sinta 3, and 6 Sinta 5), this study identifies three main dimensions of research gaps. Theoretically, there is no integrative framework linking SocEn, CSR, and Triple Helix in the DTSEN context. Empirically, there are limited studies measuring standardized social impact and multi-stakeholder collaboration. Contextually, research in developing countries, particularly Indonesia, remains limited in exploring the role of digitalization and local wisdom. Research recommendations include developing data-based collaborative models to enhance poverty alleviation program effectiveness through academia-business-government synergy supported by digital transformation.

Keywords: social entrepreneurship, CSR, triple helix, DTSEN, poverty alleviation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a multidimensional issue that requires a comprehensive and collaborative approach to address. In Indonesia, efforts to alleviate poverty have been made through various government programs; however, structural challenges such as fragmented data, weak inter-agency coordination, and limited resources remain major obstacles. On a global scale, the sustainable development paradigm embodied in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) emphasizes the importance of multi-stakeholder collaboration in achieving the goals of poverty reduction (SDG 1) and reducing inequality (SDG 10).

Social Entrepreneurship (SocEn) has emerged as an innovative approach that combines social missions with sustainable business models to address social problems (Pérez-Barea, 2025; Pujiastuti et al., 2025). Unlike conventional entrepreneurship, which is primarily focused on profit maximization, SocEn emphasizes social value creation while maintaining financial sustainability. On the other hand, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the corporate sector has evolved from mere philanthropy to a concept of shared value that integrates social responsibility into core business strategies [1].

Although both concepts have great potential for poverty alleviation, the collaboration between SocEn and CSR remains sporadic and has not yet been integrated into a systematic policy framework. The Triple Helix framework, which emphasizes collaboration between academia (universities), business (industry), and government (government), offers a synergy model that can strengthen the social entrepreneurship ecosystem [2]. However, in practice, Triple Helix collaboration in developing countries like Indonesia still faces various institutional and structural challenges.

Fragmented social data has become a crucial challenge in implementing poverty alleviation programs in Indonesia. Data on social assistance recipients is scattered across various ministries and agencies, making targeting and monitoring programs difficult. To address this, the Indonesian government issued Presidential Instruction (Inpres) No. 4 of 2025 regarding the Acceleration of Integrated Social Welfare Data (DTSEN). DTSEN aims to integrate population, economic, social, and welfare data into a single digital platform that can be accessed by all stakeholders [3].

Digital transformation through DTSEN opens new opportunities for the integration of SocEn and CSR within the Triple Helix framework. Integrated



data enables more accurate identification of beneficiaries, real-time monitoring of program impacts, and more effective collaboration between the government, social entrepreneurs, and corporations in designing targeted interventions. However, to date, there has been no comprehensive theoretical framework connecting these four elements (SocEn, CSR, Triple Helix, and DTSEN) within the context of poverty alleviation policies [4].

Based on an initial analysis of recent literature, several significant research gaps have been identified. First, theoretically, there is no integrative model explaining how SocEn and CSR can work synergistically through Triple Helix collaboration, supported by digital data infrastructure (DTSEN). Second, empirically, studies measuring the impact of multi-stakeholder collaboration on poverty alleviation outcomes are still limited, especially in the context of developing countries [5]. Third, contextually, research on the role of digitalization and local wisdom in strengthening the social entrepreneurship ecosystem in Indonesia remains scarce.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Social Entrepreneurship: Concept and Evolution

Social Entrepreneurship (SocEn) has undergone significant conceptual evolution since its emergence in the late 20th century. According [1], through a Latent Semantic Analysis of 1262 articles from 2017 to 2024, identified three main trends in the development of SocEn: (1) the consolidation of sustainability and hybrid models, (2) digital transformation, and (3) organizational and community resilience. This evolution reflects a shift from the initial concept of SocEn, which emerged from the convergence of the third sector (NGOs) and CSR, towards a more complex, hybrid model oriented towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In the context of Indonesia, Pujiastuti et al. (2025) through a systematic literature review of 94 articles identified six key dimensions that shape the social entrepreneurship ecosystem: (1) organization and policy, (2) business models, (3) socio-economic impact, (4) education and innovation, (5) religiosity, and (6) gender. These findings indicate that while the social entrepreneurship sector in Indonesia has grown significantly, structural challenges such as unclear regulatory frameworks, limited access to funding, and

a lack of collaboration among stakeholders remain major obstacles.

The foundational theory of Social Entrepreneurship is based on Social Cognitive Theory, which emphasizes the importance of self-efficacy, social motivation, and entrepreneurial orientation in shaping the intentions and behaviors of social entrepreneurs [6] demonstrated that empathy and self-efficacy significantly influence social entrepreneurship intentions among students, with social work experience enhancing empathy and university support strengthening self-efficacy.

From a gender perspective, [7] found that women are twice as likely as men to choose Social Entrepreneurship over capitalist entrepreneurship. This finding is supported by Social Role Theory, which asserts that women are more motivated by social values than economic goals. However, the study also identified that women with higher positions or extensive work experience tend to avoid choosing SocEn, indicating a trade-off between corporate careers and social missions.

2.2 Corporate Social Responsibility and Shared Value

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has undergone a paradigmatic transformation from mere philanthropy to the concept of shared value, which integrates social responsibility into core business strategies. Porter and Kramer (2011) introduced the concept of Creating Shared Value (CSV), emphasizing that companies can achieve economic success while creating social value through three approaches: (1) reconceiving products and markets, (2) redefining productivity in the value chain, and (3) enabling local cluster development.

Although the concepts of CSR and SocEn hold significant synergistic potential, the literature that integrates both remains limited. According [1] noted that the integration between CSR and social entrepreneurship is growing, especially through hybrid organizational models. However, deeper analysis of the collaboration mechanisms and the tangible contributions of corporations to the social entrepreneurship ecosystem is still limited.

In the context of Indonesia, the potential of CSR to support the social entrepreneurship ecosystem is substantial, given the strong CSR regulations (Law



No. 40 of 2007 on Limited Liability Companies and Law No. 25 of 2007 on Investment). However, [8] found that research on the integration of CSR with social entrepreneurship in Indonesia is still minimal, especially regarding effective collaboration models and standardized impact measurement.

From the perspective of SMEs, corporate CSR can act as an enabler through several mechanisms: (1) funding and social investment, (2) capacity building and mentorship, (3) market access and value chain integration, and (4) technology transfer and innovation. However, [9] found that research on SMEs in Indonesia still focuses on financial aspects and traditional entrepreneurial orientation without addressing the social dimension and collaboration with corporations through CSR programs.

2.3. Triple Helix: Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration Model

The Triple Helix model, introduced by [10], explains the dynamics of innovation through the interaction and collaboration of three key actors: academia (universities), business (industry), and government. In the context of social entrepreneurship, the Triple Helix offers a framework for understanding how these three actors can work synergistically to create an ecosystem that supports social innovation and poverty alleviation.

The role of Academia/Universities in the Triple Helix includes: (1) research and development of knowledge on social issues and intervention models, (2) education and human capital development with a social entrepreneurship mindset, (3) incubation of social ventures and provision of supporting infrastructure, and (4) facilitation of knowledge transfer between theory and practice. According [11] showed that entrepreneurship training programs at universities can effectively increase confidence, business knowledge, and women's ability to build technology-based start-ups.

The role of Business/Industry includes: (1) provision of financial resources through CSR programs and impact investment, (2) mentorship and coaching from experienced executives, (3) market access and integration into the corporate value chain, and (4) technology transfer and best practices in business management. However, [3] in a study on SMEs in Poland found that collaboration between SMEs and the corporate sector is still weak,

especially in systemic entrepreneurship models that require coordination among actors.

The role of Government includes: (1) regulation and policies that support the social entrepreneurship ecosystem, (2) provision of infrastructure and public goods, (3) funding and fiscal incentives for social enterprises, and (4) coordination and facilitation of multi-stakeholder collaboration. [8] identified that unclear regulatory frameworks and bureaucratic obstacles remain major challenges for the development of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia.

Although the Triple Helix model has been widely applied in the context of innovation systems, its application in social entrepreneurship ecosystems, particularly in developing countries, remains limited. According [2] in a study on coffee shops in Jakarta did not use the Triple Helix framework, even though their business context is highly relevant to multi-stakeholder collaboration. Similarly, [12] in a study on digital marketing in the era of Society 5.0 did not explore the role of the Triple Helix, despite the research being located in a campus environment, which is an academic node in the model.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) approach to identify and analyze research gaps in the fields of social entrepreneurship, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), and the Triple Helix collaboration. The process follows PRISMA guidelines, beginning with a systematic search of relevant literature through databases, using clear inclusion criteria related to the topic, article type, and publication period. Articles that meet these criteria are screened through title, abstract, and full-text analysis, followed by quality assessment using a score-based evaluation instrument [13].

Data analysis involves extracting key information from 15 selected articles, including the focus of the study, the theories applied, research methods, and main findings. The collected data is then synthesized to identify research gaps in three main dimensions: theoretical gap, empirical gap, and contextual gap. Theoretical gaps refer to the lack of integrative theories or models linking SocEn, CSR, Triple Helix, and digitalization in the context of poverty alleviation. Empirical gaps are observed in the limited empirical studies measuring the impact of multi-stakeholder collaboration on socio-economic



outcomes, especially in developing countries. Contextual gaps include the scarcity of research exploring the role of regulations, local wisdom, and digital technology in the development of social entrepreneurship [14].

Through this approach, the study aims to make a significant contribution by proposing a future research agenda that bridges the existing gaps. This mapping of research gaps is expected to provide a foundation for more in-depth and relevant future research, as well as offer new insights for the development of policies and practices in social entrepreneurship in Indonesia and other developing countries.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

This integrative model needs to explain: (1) the interaction mechanisms between social enterprises as innovators, CSR programs as enablers, Triple Helix collaboration as the ecosystem, and DTSEN as the digital infrastructure; (2) the contextual conditions that facilitate or hinder synergies between these elements; (3) the multi-level outcomes generated from this integration (individual, organizational, community, societal levels); and (4) the feedback loops that explain how outcomes influence the dynamics within the system.

This theoretical model can adopt the perspective of complex adaptive systems, recognizing that the social entrepreneurship ecosystem is a complex system with multiple actors, multiple levels, and emergent properties. This approach can explain how Triple Helix collaboration, supported by DTSEN infrastructure, creates conditions for self-organization and co-evolution within the SE ecosystem [15].

In the context of DTSEN, it is crucial to integrate the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) or the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) with social entrepreneurship theory to explain: (1) the factors influencing the adoption of digital technologies by social entrepreneurs; (2) how the unique characteristics of social entrepreneurship (dual mission, resource constraints, focus on underserved populations) affect technology adoption decisions; (3) how technology adoption impacts social impact and sustainability; and (4) the contextual conditions (infrastructure, digital

literacy, regulatory environment) that moderate these relationships.

This theoretical integration is vital for understanding the digital divide within the SE ecosystem and designing strategies for inclusive digital transformation [16]. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of creating frameworks that can support social enterprises in overcoming technological barriers, ensuring equitable access to digital tools, and maximizing the social value created through the adoption of digital technologies. By addressing these factors, the model aims to contribute to the development of more resilient and sustainable social enterprises in the digital age.

Social entrepreneurs must strengthen their business acumen to ensure financial sustainability while maintaining their social mission. This requires (a) a solid understanding of financial management and business model innovation, (b) the capability to measure and communicate social impact to investors and partners, (c) the ability to attract and retain talent, and (d) skills in stakeholder management and partnership building. The integration of these competencies is essential for social enterprises to navigate the complexities of balancing social value creation with financial stability. As social entrepreneurship grows, developing a strong business foundation becomes increasingly important to attract resources and sustain long-term impact.

Social entrepreneurs need to proactively seek collaborations with various stakeholders. These collaborations can include (a) partnerships with universities for access to research, talent, and incubation support, (b) partnerships with corporations for funding, mentorship, and market access, (c) collaborations with government entities for policy advocacy, program access, and regulatory support, and (d) networking with other social enterprises for knowledge sharing and collective action. Building such collaborations is crucial for creating an ecosystem where resources, expertise, and opportunities are shared, ultimately enhancing the overall effectiveness of social entrepreneurship initiatives. By leveraging the strengths of different stakeholders, social entrepreneurs can amplify their impact and foster a more collaborative approach to solving social challenges.



Discussion

Social entrepreneurs need to embrace digital transformation to enhance efficiency, reach, and impact. This includes (a) utilizing digital platforms for marketing and customer acquisition, (b) leveraging data analytics for better targeting and personalization, (c) adopting digital tools for operations and impact monitoring, and (d) participating in digital ecosystems such as DTSEN to access beneficiary data and coordinate with other actors [17]. By incorporating digital solutions, social enterprises can expand their operations, improve service delivery, and better track the outcomes of their initiatives. This digital shift is pivotal in scaling social impact and ensuring that resources are effectively allocated to areas that can generate the most significant change [18].

The government must develop a clear regulatory framework for social enterprises (SE). Currently, the legal status of SEs in Indonesia remains ambiguous, with these entities being categorized as NGOs, cooperatives, or ordinary businesses. A clear regulatory framework would provide legal certainty, facilitating SE access to funding, incentives, and government programs. By establishing a distinct legal identity for social enterprises, the government can ensure that these organizations can operate with confidence and effectively contribute to addressing social issues. Moreover, clarity in regulations would enable better monitoring and evaluation of SE activities, ensuring that they align with national development goals and the broader agenda of social impact [19].

Strengthen the implementation of Presidential Instruction No. 4 of 2025 regarding DTSEN by ensuring (a) interoperability of data systems across ministries/agencies, (b) data quality and regular updates, (c) appropriate levels of data sharing that balance privacy and security, (d) capacity building for stakeholders in data utilization, and (e) mechanisms for feedback and correction from beneficiaries.

Furthermore, the government should design incentives to encourage Triple Helix collaboration, such as (a) competitive grants for collaborative projects between universities, businesses, and government, (b) tax incentives for companies supporting SE through CSR programs, (c) public procurement policies that give preference to social

enterprises, and (d) the creation of innovation hubs or social innovation labs to facilitate collaboration. Lastly, the government must address the digital divide by (a) investing in digital infrastructure in underserved regions, (b) providing digital literacy programs for SMEs and social entrepreneurs, (c) offering subsidies or vouchers for internet and device access for SEs in poor areas, and (d) developing a user-friendly DTSEN interface for users with low digital literacy [20]. These measures are essential for fostering a more inclusive digital transformation and enhancing the capacity of SEs to contribute to sustainable development.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study provides a deeper understanding of the integration of Social Entrepreneurship (SocEn), Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), and Triple Helix within the context of poverty alleviation policies based on the Integrated Social Welfare Data (DTSEN). While the literature on these concepts has developed, systematic integration among the three remains limited, with theoretical fragmentation leading to a partial understanding of poverty alleviation through multi-stakeholder collaboration. Furthermore, although Triple Helix collaboration has great potential to strengthen the social entrepreneurship ecosystem, institutional and structural challenges in developing countries like Indonesia remain significant barriers.

This study also reveals the importance of digital transformation through DTSEN, which opens opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of poverty alleviation programs, despite challenges such as the digital divide and privacy concerns. Additionally, the lack of standardized social impact measurement and the contextual factors influencing the success of social entrepreneurship are identified as key aspects. The study highlights the need for greater attention to gender and inclusion dimensions, which are still underexplored in the Indonesian SE literature, as well as the importance of considering contextual adaptation when adopting SE models from other contexts.

VI. REFERENCE

- [1] J. Barea, "The Evolution of Social Entrepreneurship: Broadening the Framework for the Digital and Sustainable Era," *N/A*, 2025.
- [2] S. Cristian & Puspitowati, I., "MEDIATOR



- MANAJEMEN PENGETAHUAN TERHADAP INOVASI DAN ORIENTASI KEWIRAUSAHAAN TERHADAP KINERJA BISNIS,” *J. Manajerial dan Kewirausahaan*, 2025.
- [3] D. Duraj, “Model of Entrepreneurship and Social-cultural and Market Orientation of Small Business Owners in Poland,” *N/A*, 2010.
- [4] N. Fauziah, T. M. S. Mubarak, and ..., “Exploring the Role of Digital Literacy and E-Commerce in Shaping Digital Entrepreneurial Interest,” *Bus. Innov. ...*, 2024, [Online]. Available: <http://ejournals.fkwu.uniga.ac.id/index.php/BI-EJ/article/view/942>.
- [5] J. F. Guadaño & López, S. M., “Gender Differences in Social Entrepreneurship: Evidence from Spain,” *Womens. Stud. Int. Forum*, 2023.
- [6] M. T. Sambodo, S. Hidayat, and A. Z. Rahmayanti, “Towards a new approach to community-based rural development: Lessons learned from Indonesia,” *Cogent Soc. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2023, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2023.2267741.
- [7] J. M. Díaz-Puente, S. Martín-Fernández, D. Suárez, V. D. Castro-Muñoz, and M. Bettoni, “The Main Risk Factors for Rural Innovation in Europe: An Analysis of 200 Case Studies,” *Eur. J. Innov. Manag.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 1603–1618, 2022, doi: 10.1108/ejim-01-2022-0037.
- [8] N. Pujiastuti Prabawani, B., Pradhanawati, A., & Listyorini, S., “Trends and challenges of Indonesian social entrepreneurship research: a systematic literature review (2013-2023),” *JPPI (Jurnal Penelit. Pendidik. Indones.)*, 2025.
- [9] S. Fauziah & Ridho, W., “PENGUATAN KINERJA USAHA PADA UMKM: PERAN KNOWLEDGE OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DAN ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION,” *J. Pemikir. dan Penelit. Adm. Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 2024.
- [10] U. Hapsari, H. Siregar, T. Novianti, and N. Zulfainarni, “Analysis of LQ45 and ESG Stock Return Volatility on the Indonesia Stock Exchange,” *J. Ilm. Akunt. Kesatuan*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1001–1012, 2025, doi: 10.37641/jiakes.v13i4.3533.
- [11] D. Serrano Sánchez, A., Burgos, E., Paz Martín, Catalina Llorente, & Aikaterini Lalatsa., “Women as Industry 4.0 entrepreneurs: unlocking the potential of entrepreneurship in Higher Education in STEM-related fields,” *J. Innov. Entrep.*, 2023.
- [12] V. A. Tsuraya, L. Hidayatullah, D. Triani, A. N. Istiqomah, F. Putri, and W. Lusianingrum, “Pelatihan Kewirausahaan Guna Menumbuhkan Minat Berwirausaha,” *JMM (Jurnal Masy. Mandiri)*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 2–9, 2021.
- [13] A. N. D. Ani and R. Y. Kurniawan, “Systematic Literature Review (SLR): Pengaruh Pendidikan Kewirausahaan Dan Locus of Control Terhadap Intensi Berwirausaha,” *J. Bisnis Dan Kewirausahaan*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 336–342, 2023, doi: 10.37476/jbk.v12i3.4068.
- [14] J. W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2014.
- [15] N. Putu, S. Maryati, and A. A. N. B. Dwirandra, “Self-Motivation and Adversity Quotient Moderates the Effect of Exam Costs on Student Interest in Taking the Chartered Accountant Certification Exam,” *Am. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 74–84, 2021.
- [16] S. N. Hidayah and R. H. Nugroho, “Pengaruh Citra Merek, Harga, Kualitas Produk Terhadap Loyalitas Pelanggan Dengan Kepuasan Konsumen Sebagai Variabel Intervening,” *J. Ilm. Adm. Bisnis Dan Inov.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 79–98, 2023, doi: 10.25139/jiabi.v7i1.5811.
- [17] N. A. Hamdani, G. Abdul, F. Maulani, and M. G. Profile, “Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy , Passion , and Opportunity Recognition in Garut ’ s Millennial Coffee Entrepreneurs,” vol. 7, no. 2, 2025.
- [18] L. D. Sembiring, A. Setyawati, and ..., “... of increasing the competitiveness of MSME business through entrepreneurial competence, entrepreneurial orientation, and customers relationship management,” ... *Manag. ...*, 2025, [Online]. Available: <https://e-journal.president.ac.id/index.php/FIRM-JOURNAL/article/view/4575>.
- [19] E. Syapitri, “STUDI LITERATUR : ANALISIS PENINGKATAN PENJUALAN UMKM MELALUI PENERAPAN DIGITAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP DAN DIGITAL MARKETING,” *N/A*, 2024.



- [20] G. A. F. Maulan, E. Dinanti, S. Mustika, N. A. Hamdani, and I. Permana, *The Influence of Product Composition Information and Brand Trust on Purchasing Decision*, no. Gcbme

2023. Atlantis Press International BV, 2024.

