

Possible Factors Determining Individual Decisions as Sociopreneurs in the National Strategic Tourism Area of Borobudur

Hafidz Nasim Habibi¹, Ikhtiara Anggitiya Intan², Yunita Kusumaningrum³, Yetty Syarifah⁴, Nasywaa Fauziyah⁵, Jihad Lukis Panjawa⁶

Tidar University^{1,2,3,4,5,6}

Email: hafidz.nasim.habibi@students.untidar.ac.id¹, ikhtiara.anggitiya.intan@students.untidar.ac.id², yunita.kusumaningrum@students.untidar.ac.id³, yetty.syarifah@students.untidar.ac.id⁴, nasywaa.fauziyah@students.untidar.ac.id⁵, jipanjawa@untidar.ac.id⁶

ABSTRACT

As an innovative solution to social issues and a driver of the local economy, sociopreneurship holds crucial relevance in strategic areas such as the national strategic tourism area of Borobudur. This study aims to analyze the determining factors that influence individuals' decisions to become sociopreneurs in the area. Using Utility Theory and Neoclassical Labor Choice Theory, the study applies a quantitative approach with a probit regression model. Primary data were analyzed from 140 respondents (sociopreneurs and non-sociopreneurs) selected through purposive sampling. The main results indicate that age, training, community participation, number of workers, and local resources have a significant positive effect. Conversely, the use of production technology has a negative effect, while capital and formal education factors are not significant. The main conclusion suggests that the decision to become a sociopreneur is driven by a balance of social and economic utility, not simply capital. The implications of this research recommend strengthening policies focused on community-based training and utilization of local resources

Keywords:

Sociopreneurship;
Decision Making;
Tourism Area;

INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurs introduce themselves as an alternative to addressing social issues within communities. (Gunadi et al., 2021). Internationally, Indonesia ranked eighth out of 44 countries in the category of best countries to become social entrepreneurs in 2019 (Tran, 2019). This ranking indicates that Indonesia is a very supportive country for social entrepreneurs to start and develop social-based businesses, thereby providing a positive impact on society. Additionally, there are approximately 342,000 organizations in Indonesia engaged in social entrepreneurship, but only about 2,000 are officially recognized as social entrepreneurs. This situation demonstrates the potential for social entrepreneurs in Indonesia, considering the rapid growth of social entrepreneurship and strong environmental support (Pujiastuti, 2022).

The number of sociopreneurs in Indonesia has increased significantly over the past five years, with the British Council noting a 70% rise in Sociopreneurship trends. Meanwhile, according to a survey conducted by the British Council, the Sociopreneurship industry accounts for 1.91% of Indonesia's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This percentage is equivalent to IDR 19.4 billion, with the creative industry sector dominating at 22%, followed by the agriculture and fisheries sector at 16%, the education sector at 15%, and the service sector at 13% (Kasih, 2022). This upward trend indicates that sociopreneurship is growing in Indonesia, with the younger generation playing a driving role. In addition to creating social impact, sociopreneurs

also make significant contributions to the national economy, particularly in the creative industry.

Potential Sociopreneurship can empower communities by enhancing skills, building capacity, and creating jobs. (Nasila and Napu, 2024). Sociopreneurship has great potential as an innovative solution because it focuses not only on profit but also on a social mission to address community issues. Active community involvement as Sociopreneurs allows the benefits from their business activities to be redistributed back to the community, which can then be managed for community development. (Susanti, 2021). The growth of Sociopreneurship within communities can help improve living standards, open employment opportunities, and provide new values such as innovation and creativity in social and economic environments. In addition, Sociopreneurs can serve as social capital, supporting efforts to enhance social development, promote greater equality, and distribute welfare to the wider society. (Purba and Siregar, 2023).

Social entrepreneurship plays a vital role in improving communities' economic independence. The main criterion for Sociopreneurs is the social mission that underpins every business activity. This social mission aims to identify and solve social problems. (Ariski et al., 2023). Internal and external factors influence a person's decision to start their own business. Internal factors include knowledge, motivation, self-confidence, skills, and capital, all of which affect entrepreneurial decision-making. (Sunatar et al., 2024). External factors such as technology, capital, and access to business opportunities also influence individual choices (Irawati, 2017).

Decision-making theories originate in economics, a systematic approach to choosing the best among several alternatives to solve problems. Utility theory is one of the decision-making theories used as an index to measure an individual's level of satisfaction and happiness. Utility theory explains how individuals make decisions based on expected benefits or the level of satisfaction gained from a choice (Mankiw, 2018). Additionally, the Neoclassical Model of Work Choice or Leisure explains that individuals allocate their time between work and leisure. These decisions are based on the total number of hours available. (Borjas, 2016). Based on these two theories, a concept can be developed to explain an individual's decision to work while also becoming a social entrepreneur or to choose other activities, which can be explained by utility theory. Furthermore, this concept provides a framework for analyzing individual rationality in achieving maximum satisfaction and effectively utilizing limited time.

Based on existing research, factors that influence decision-making and interest in entrepreneurship, especially in the socio-entrepreneurship context, can be grouped into internal and external factors. Internal factors, which are inherent to individuals, have proven to be very important. However, studies have produced varied findings regarding specific variables. Damayanti and Harti (2013) research reported no significant influence of gender on entrepreneurial decisions among students, while the latest research by Sundari and Lubis (2024) identified gender as a significant determinant of interest in entrepreneurship. Conversely, a stronger consensus emerged around cognitive and psychological attributes. Internal factors such as thinking creatively and innovatively consistently showed a positive influence on students' interest in entrepreneurship (Putri and Salsebela, 2025; Rahmi and Rahmisyari, 2023; Triyani et al., 2021). Additionally, personality and environmental

factors were also identified as significant positive factors by (Sunatar et al., 2024). Furthermore, external motivation, including formal guidance and training aimed at students, showed a considerable positive impact on interest in startup entrepreneurship (Az et al., 2023). This aligns with findings by Yuniasanti et al. (2024), who through pre- and post-studies on housewives, demonstrated that education and training effectively increase interest in starting socio-entrepreneurship. Broader studies on students also reinforce the positive influence of formal education and entrepreneurship knowledge on entrepreneurial decision-making (Hasniati and Syahrudin, 2022; Hassan et al., 2022; Okthafiani et al., 2024). The wider socio-economic environment is also identified as a major influence on entrepreneurial decisions, as noted in studies by (Az et al., 2023; Sunatar et al., 2024).

Previous research found that access to capital has a negative but not significant effect on entrepreneurial interest (Meifa, 2022). Conversely, Panjawa et al. (2024) identified capital as a factor that has a significantly positive influence on an individual's likelihood of entering the business world. In the context of technology-based companies, Belmonte et al. (2022) emphasized that access to capital, along with computer skills and entrepreneurial experience, significantly predicts technopreneurial intention. Findings related to technology adoption are also diverse. Although Zenebe et al. (2018) showed a significant positive correlation between IT knowledge and entrepreneurial orientation, Panjawa et al. (2024) reported an unexpected significant negative influence of production technology on entrepreneurial interest.

Based on the presented phenomenon, it is interesting to analyze sociopreneurs in certain areas, such as in Magelang, one of the regions with the Borobudur National Strategic Tourism Area. Magelang's advantage in the tourism sector and Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) provides opportunities for the local community to develop sociopreneurship. These two sectors not only support the local economy but also encourage the community to participate actively in creating solutions based on sociopreneurship. The lack of comprehensive research on sociopreneurs in tourist areas makes this topic interesting to explore further. Therefore, this study analyzes the determining factors of individuals' decisions to become sociopreneurs using a more complex approach with limited dependent variables, particularly probit regression.

METHOD

This research uses a quantitative, explanatory design. Limited dependent variable approach through probit regression is employed to analyze the probability of individual decision determinants becoming sociopreneurs in the Borobudur National Tourism Strategic Area. The data used are primary data collected through surveys. The instrument used is a questionnaire. The population in this study includes the community of Magelang who are sociopreneurs. Since the population size and proportion are unknown, the sample size determination uses Cochran's Formula 1997 (Uakarn et al., 2021).

Based on a calculation using Cochran's formula with a significance level of 10% and a margin of error of 10%, the sample size is 70 sociopreneurs and 70 non-sociopreneurs. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling, which involves selecting respondents who meet the criteria as sociopreneur actors or non-sociopreneur actors in Borobudur, covering the areas of Magelang City and Regency.

Table 1. Research Variables

No	Variable	Definition	Proxy
1	Individual entrepreneurs decision (Y)	Individual's decision to become an entrepreneur.	<i>Sociopreneur</i> (1); <i>non-sociopreneur</i> (0).
2	Gender (<i>gen</i>)	Gender of the business owner.	Gender: male (1); female (0).
3	Age (<i>age</i>)	Age of the business owner.	Age (years).
4	Educational level (<i>educ</i>)	The level of education possessed by the business owner.	Level of education for high school level or equivalent or below (0); others (1).
5	Training (<i>train</i>)	Training that has been or is currently being attended by the business owner.	Ever attended training/skills (1); currently attending/never (0).
6	Background of the initiative (<i>bginisiatif</i>)	The background of the establishment of a sociopreneur is due to training or inheritance (as a basic category).	Self-initiated (1); others (0).
7	Background of the initiative (<i>bgtrain</i>)	The background of the establishment of sociopreneurship is due to training or inheritance (as a basic category).	Training (1); others (0).
8	Participation (<i>com</i>)	Participation of the business owner in a union/association.	Member of a union or association (1); not a member (0).
9	Modal (<i>cap</i>)	The initial modal used.	Business effort modal (Rupiah).
10	Labor (<i>lab</i>)	The number of workers employed.	Number of workers (people).
11	Raw material source (<i>res</i>)	The origin of the raw materials used.	Raw materials >50% come from Magelang (1); >50% come from outside Magelang (0).
12	Production technology (<i>tprod</i>)	The use of technology in the production process	Yes (1); No (0).

Probit regression is a non-linear model that can be estimated using the maximum likelihood (ML) method. This method is useful for illustrating the direction of the relationship between variables, which can be interpreted through the probit model coefficients by calculating the change in the probability value on the marginal effect. When the marginal effect value is positive, it means that the independent variable in categorical form (dummy variable) with specific characteristics (X-1) will have a higher chance than its comparison category to produce a successful event (Y-1) by the marginal effect. Meanwhile, for a continuous dependent variable, a positive marginal effect indicates that each unit increase in that variable increases the likelihood of a successful event (Y=1) by the amount of the marginal effect. The probit regression model is derived from utility theory and neoclassical labor choice theory, and the general equation is $P_i(Y_i=1|X_i)=\phi(\beta_0+\beta_1X_i)$, so the equation of this research model is:

$$P_i(Y_i = 1|X_i) = \phi(\beta_0 + \beta_1gen_i + \beta_2age_i + \beta_3educ_i + \beta_4train_i + \beta_5bginisiatif_i + \beta_6bgtrain + \beta_7com_i + \beta_8cap_i + \beta_9lab_i + \beta_{10}res_i + \beta_{11}tprod_i)$$

Score $P_i(Y_i = 1)$ indicating the probability that individual i decides to become a sociopreneur, with a value of 0 indicating a decision not to become a sociopreneur, β while is a parameter. Complete information about the research variables is presented in Table 1. Research Variables. Model evaluation includes three tests: the overall

model fit test, the regression model's goodness of fit test with Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, and an assessment of the model's strength through Pseudo R-squared.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Sociopreneur Respondents

. Summarize y gen age aduc train lab cap res tprod com bgtrain bginisiatif

Variabel	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Y	70	1	0	1	1
Gen	70	.5714286	.4984448	0	1
Age	70	46.6	9.608873	28	76
Educ	70	.1285714	.3371418	0	1
Train	70	.8571429	.3524537	0	1
Lab	70	7.3	5.739136	1	25
Cap	70	6018257	1.03e+07	100000	5.00e+07
Res	70	.9428571	.2337913	0	1
Tprod	70	.5428571	.5017567	0	1
Com	70	.6142857	.4902782	0	1
Bgtrain	70	.0571429	.2337913	0	1
Bginisiatif	70	.7285714	.4479075	0	1

Table 3. Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Non-Sociopreneur

Variabel	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Y	70	0	0	0	0
Gen	70	.5428571	.5017567	0	1
Age	70	44.27143	9.608873	22	73
Educ	70	.0714286	.2593989	0	1
Train	70	.4714286	.5027873	0	1
Lab	70	2.628571	3.126193	1	25
Cap	70	3806429	6094105	100000	3.00e+07
Res	70	.9142857	.281963	0	1
Tprod	70	.6571429	.4780914	0	1
Com	70	.3714286	.4866755	0	1
Bgtrain	70	.0428571	.2039973	0	1
Bginisiatif	70	.7142857	.4550158	0	1

Based on the descriptive statistical tests in Tables 2 and 3, 140 respondents are operating in the Borobudur National Strategic Tourism Area. A total of 70 individuals are identified as sociopreneurs (y=1), and the remaining 70 are non-sociopreneurs (y=0). These values indicate a balanced proportion between the two sectors. From the perspective of individual characteristics, the majority of sociopreneur respondents are male, accounting for 57.1%, indicating that men dominate as sociopreneurs. Meanwhile, non-sociopreneur respondents are also predominantly male, making up 54.2%. This finding suggests that male participation is more active in both sectors of sociopreneurship, although the proportion is higher among sociopreneurs. Female participation still shows significant potential within sociopreneurship, even though overall it indicates lower values. Women tend to focus on empowering local communities through crafts, social services, or regional cuisine. These findings indicate that there are opportunities for women to engage as sociopreneurs.

The average age of sociopreneur business owners is 46 years, with an age range from 28 to 76. For non-sociopreneur entrepreneurs, the average age is slightly younger at 44 years, with an age range from 22 to 73. In terms of education, respondents who chose to become sociopreneurs mostly have a minimum education

level of high school or below, totaling 61 individuals. In contrast, non-sociopreneurs with a nearly similar but slightly higher proportion are 65 individuals with a high school education or below. These findings show that the proportion of highly educated respondents is relatively small, but their presence is essential because they usually possess good managerial skills compared to individuals with only high school education or below. Moreover, in the context of sociopreneurship, they can play roles as drivers of innovation or facilitators for other entrepreneurs. The background in establishing a business is also significant: among social entrepreneurs, 51 individuals started their businesses on their own initiative, while the rest did so through training or inheritance. For non-sociopreneurs, 50 individuals started their businesses on their own initiative, while the remaining did so through training or inheritance.

From an external perspective, involvement in training also contributes to building readiness to start a business. A total of 60 respondents, or approximately 85.7%, who chose to become sociopreneurs, stated that they have participated in training such as digital marketing, financial management, and others. For non-sociopreneurs, 33 individuals or about 47.1% have undergone training. These percentages indicate that training contributes significantly to shaping sociopreneurial orientation because it enables individuals to gain skills beyond education. Training has a greater impact on individuals who choose to become sociopreneurs than on non-sociopreneur entrepreneurs. Among sociopreneurs, 43 respondents (61%) are involved in community activities, while among non-sociopreneurs, 26 individuals (37%) participate in communities. This finding shows that sociopreneurs tend to join communities to expand networks and strengthen cooperation among entrepreneurs. The proportion of community participation is higher among sociopreneurs, reflecting that social entrepreneurs prioritize not only economic aspects but also emphasize camaraderie in building the local economy.

Characteristics of the business also become an important factor in deciding to become a sociopreneur. The average initial capital required to establish a sociopreneur's business is IDR 6 million, while for non-sociopreneurs, it is IDR 3.8 million. Additionally, sociopreneur owners have an average of 7 employees, whereas non-sociopreneur owners have an average of 3 employees. Regarding the use of raw materials, sociopreneurs depend on local sources, with 94.2% of their reliance on local sources. This dependence on local resources indicates that sociopreneurs are more focused on utilizing regional potential to create sustainable local economies. For non-sociopreneur businesses, 91.4% use resources from the local area. This proportion is almost balanced, indicating similarities in the pattern of utilizing local resources between the two types of business actors. However, the proportion of local resources used by sociopreneurs is significant, reflecting social ties that support relationships with local suppliers and enhance the local economy. In contrast, in the context of non-sociopreneurs, local resources are used to reduce production costs without a strong social orientation. From the aspect of technology adoption in the production process, social entrepreneurs demonstrate a technology integration level of 54.2%, whereas non-sociopreneurs have a higher adoption level of 65.7%. This finding indicates that in utilizing technology, sociopreneurs tend to balance with social objectives. Additionally, the production methods used tend to be labor-intensive, aimed at empowering local communities. This model aligns with the characteristics of

sociopreneurs who focus on community empowerment and the benefits to the environment as their primary business activities.

Overall, the descriptive data indicate that between sociopreneurs and non-sociopreneurs, there are nearly identical characteristics. Both business groups face similar challenges, namely gender differences, limited capital, and the dominance of education levels below secondary. Sociopreneurs tend to have a greater social capacity, which is reflected in their high engagement in community activities or training, as well as a balance between social and economic goals in managing their businesses. This finding reinforces the complexity of the factors that influence an individual's decision to become a sociopreneur.

Table 4. Probit Regression

Variable	Individual Sociopreneur Decisions (Y)	Marginal Effect	VIF
gen	-.2148016	-.0568209	1.11
age	.0251274	.0066998	1.11
educ	.1396547	.0369425	1.15
train	.8507824	.225055	1.35
lab	.1653068	.0437281	1.19
cap	2.29e-08	6.07e-09	1.12
res	.3457183	.0914519	1.06
tprod	-.5664642	-.1498452	1.09
com	.495219	.1309989	1.26
bgtrain	.3579593	.09469	1.26
bginitiatif	-.0941792	-.0249129	1.24
cons	-2.671961		
Diagnostic test			
Pseudo r-squared	0.3411	Goodnees of Fit test	0.0000
Chi-square	66.19	(Pearson Chisq.)	
Akaike crit./AIC		Correctly classified	
		Bayesian crit./BIC	

Notes: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.10; (p-value); Y is Sociopreneur (1) and 0 Non-Sociopreneur

Based on the Goodness of Fit test results, the Prob > chi² value is 0.0000 and the Pseudo R² is 0.3411. These values indicate that the model used is significant and the model is adequate (fit). The Pseudo R² of 34.11% can explain the relationship between the independent variables and the decision to become a sociopreneur in the Borobudur National Strategic Tourism Area. These values show the strength level of the nonlinear probit model, which is quite good. This model is strengthened by the fulfillment of all basic assumptions in the multicollinearity test, indicating that the entire model is good and does not exhibit multicollinearity. Therefore, these findings form the basis to affirm that the variables in this study are relevant and capable of explaining the factors influencing individual decisions to become a sociopreneur.

Age has a significant positive effect on the individual's decision with a coefficient of 0.2532 and a marginal effect of 0.00669. These values indicate that each additional year will increase an individual's likelihood of becoming a sociopreneur by 0.6%, assuming other factors remain constant. This reflects that as age increases, the tendency to make decisions as a sociopreneur also increases.

Education has a positive but not statistically significant influence with a coefficient of 0.1396 and a marginal effect of 0.3694. These values indicate that each increase in education level can raise the likelihood of becoming a sociopreneur by

36.94%, although the effect is not statistically significant. However, formal education still functions to develop skills, even though it is not the sole determining factor.

Training has a significant positive effect on individual decisions, with a coefficient of 0.8507 and a marginal effect of 0.2250. These values suggest that individuals who have participated in training are about 22.5% more likely to become sociopreneurs compared to those who have not attended training, assuming other factors are constant. This condition indicates that training contributes to increased knowledge and motivation to become a sociopreneur.

The background of training has a significant positive but marginal influence, with a coefficient of 0.3579 and a marginal effect of 0.9469. These values show that individuals with a training background are 9.469% more likely to become a sociopreneur, although this is not yet statistically significant. This suggests that experience gained from training contributes to readiness to run a social enterprise. Positive and significant influence community with a coefficient of 0.4952 and a marginal effect of 0.1309. These values indicate that community involvement can increase the likelihood of becoming a sociopreneur by 13.09%. This means that the community allows individuals to establish mutual cooperation and collaboration among entrepreneurs, thereby expanding networks and achieving social and economic success.

The number of workers has a positive and significant effect with a coefficient of 0.1653 and a marginal effect of 0.0437. These values show that each additional worker increases the likelihood that an individual will become a sociopreneur. This finding suggests that sociopreneurs tend to create jobs, thereby empowering the local community. The resource variable shows a positive and significant influence with a coefficient of 0.3457 and a marginal effect of 0.0914. This indicates that an increase in the availability of resources, such as raw materials from local sources, substantially raises the chances of an individual becoming a sociopreneur by 9.14%. This underscores that raw material resources are a crucial factor in encouraging participation in sociopreneurship. The use of technology in the production process has a significant negative effect with a coefficient of -0.5664 and a marginal effect of -0.1498. This means that technology use causes profitability for sociopreneurs to decrease by 14.98%. This finding confirms that the production methods used by entrepreneurs tend to be traditional (labor-intensive), emphasizing the principle of sociopreneurs focusing on empowering the local community.

Conversely, gender (gen), education level (educ), initiative background (bginisiatif), and capital (cap) do not show a significant effect on an individual's likelihood of becoming a sociopreneur. This suggests that these factors are not primary determinants of sociopreneurship formation. Gender does not have a statistically significant effect on the probability of an individual becoming a sociopreneur, with a coefficient of -0.2148 and a marginal effect of -0.0568. This confirms that gender does not significantly influence the decision to become a sociopreneur. Therefore, men and women have equal opportunities to become social entrepreneurs. Education has a positive effect but is not statistically significant because the p -value > 0.10 , with a coefficient of 0.1396 and a marginal effect of 0.3694. This indicates that education level is not a main factor in the decision to become a sociopreneur. This condition shows that success in sociopreneurship is not only based on knowledge but also requires practical experience. The initiative

background has a coefficient of -0.0941 and a marginal effect of -0.0249, indicating a negative but not statistically significant effect. This emphasizes that the purpose of establishing a business from personal initiative does not have a real impact on the decision to become a sociopreneur. Capital has a coefficient of 2.29e-08 and a marginal effect of 6.07e-09, which suggests that this variable is not statistically significant. This value indicates that a slight increase in capital marginally improves the profitability of individuals becoming sociopreneurs; however, social entrepreneurs tend to use a relatively large initial capital compared to non-sociopreneurs. Therefore, the amount of capital does not influence the decision to become a sociopreneur and is not a primary factor motivating individuals to pursue sociopreneurship. Thus, these results highlight the importance of strengthening social capacity through training, community networks, and utilization of local resources as the main drivers for creating inclusive and competitive sociopreneurs. Additionally, these findings provide an empirical basis for developing more targeted policies to support a sustainable sociopreneurship ecosystem in tourism areas and local economies.

Probit regression analysis provides an in-depth understanding of the factors that influence the probability of an individual's decision to become a sociopreneur in the Borobudur National Tourism Strategic Area. Based on utility theory and the neoclassical model of labor or leisure choice, an individual's decision to optimize economic choices with the goal of maximizing utility obtained from limited resources is assumed to be rational. From a sociopreneurship perspective, the utility gained has social benefits for the local environment or surrounding community, not just economic gains. Therefore, the decision to become a sociopreneur results from a combined consideration of economic and social benefits. The research findings indicate that factors such as age, training, training background, community, workforce, and the availability of local resources positively influence an individual's decision to become a sociopreneur. Conversely, the use of production technology has a negative effect on individual decisions, while gender, education level, capital, and initiative background do not have significant effects.

The significant positive effect observed on the age variable reflects that as age increases, the higher the likelihood of an individual becoming a sociopreneur. These findings align with the utility theory concept, which states that more mature individuals tend to have better ability to assess economic and social benefits through business activities. This result is consistent with the research by Coduras et al. (2018), which states that middle age is the golden age when individuals are most likely to start a business. Meanwhile, according to Brieger et al. (2021), very young and very old individuals are more motivated to undertake sociopreneurship activities.

The training variable has proven to have a significant positive effect on the decision to become a sociopreneur. Training can add utility by enhancing managerial capacity, risk management, and the ability to incorporate social values into economic activities. These findings are in line with the neoclassical model of labor or leisure choice, which explains that rational individuals will allocate time and resources in a way that provides the highest utility. This condition is supported by Hasniati and Syahrudin, (2022); Okthafiani et al., (2024), who found that training improves entrepreneurship competencies and broadens success opportunities.

Participation in the community also shows a significant positive influence, reinforcing the argument that social networks provide substantial social and economic

benefits for entrepreneurs. In the context of utility theory, individual participation in the community can increase utility, through cooperation and information exchange, thereby expanding access to resources and markets. These findings are consistent with the research by Sunatar et al. (2024), which states that environmental factors have a significant positive effect on entrepreneurial decisions. The environment encompasses various external activities, including involvement in the community, which can support the development of entrepreneurship. This is in line with the research by Khan et al. (2019), which shows that social networks have a significantly positive influence on entrepreneurial competence. In the context of the Borobudur National Strategic Tourism Area, communities function as a platform for collaboration to share resources, expand markets, and foster local economic solidarity. This strengthens the argument that individual participation in the community can enhance innovation capacity and resource utilization to support the success of sociopreneurship activities. The similar result was also found in the labor variable which has a positive influence on the decision to become a sociopreneur. These findings support the assumption that with an increase in the number of workers, the formed social orientation becomes more prominent. In the neoclassical model of labor or leisure choice, labor becomes the main production factor in determining the level of output. In the context of sociopreneurship, labor can provide social benefits through job creation and empowerment of local communities. This result is in line with the research conducted by Nguyen et al. (2021), which states that labor can expand socioeconomic benefits through job creation, thereby improving community welfare.

Next, the availability of local resources has a significant positive effect on the decision to become a sociopreneur. This finding supports the utility theory, because using local raw materials can add social benefit value, reduce production costs, and strengthen the local economy. The utilization of local resources also enhances social legitimacy and business sustainability, as stated by Brixiova and Egert (2017), that to encourage the formation of new businesses in challenging environments, conducive production environment conditions are necessary, including access to production factors and skills. This supports the assumption that the availability of local resources (raw materials, facilities) becomes an important determinant in the decision to become a sociopreneur. Variable background of training has a significant positive marginal effect. This indicates that an individual's experience in training activities adds utility value and increases the tendency for sociopreneurship. This finding aligns with utility theory, which states that training can increase utility gain for individuals through improved ability to optimize limited resources to achieve social objectives. These results are consistent with the learning by doing theory within the neoclassical framework, where empirical experience improves efficiency and reduces uncertainty in production. This is supported by studies by Mahendra et al. (2017; Nabi et al., 2018), which show that entrepreneurship training can shape entrepreneurial intentions and individuals' readiness to engage in entrepreneurial activities.

Conversely, the variable of technology use in production shows a significant negative effect on the decision to become a sociopreneur. This finding indicates that high technology use does not always increase utility for social entrepreneurs. In the context of sociopreneurship, overly efficient technology can diminish local labor involvement, potentially shifting the social focus of the enterprise toward profit orientation. This aligns with research by Xu and Ye (2021), which explains that robotics

or highly efficient technology use can reduce labor involvement and thereby decrease social value. The capital factor shows a positive but nonsignificant relationship, indicating that the amount of initial capital is not a primary determinant of the decision to become a sociopreneur. This differs from the basic assumption of neoclassical theory, which places capital as an essential production factor, but the results suggest a shift towards social utility as a rational basis. Social entrepreneurs tend to value social benefits more than pure economic gains. This finding aligns with views by Defourny and Nyssens (2017), which state that in social enterprises, social orientation often plays a more crucial role in entrepreneurial decision-making than financial factors. Nevertheless, the research data shows that sociopreneurs tend to have a higher average initial capital compared to entrepreneurs in general. This reflects that high capital is not the main driver for social motivation; rather, a social orientation requires greater resources.

Furthermore, gender and background of initiative do not have a significant effect on the decision to become a sociopreneur. These results indicate that opportunities for sociopreneurship are inclusive, with both men and women having equal chances of achieving high utility from social benefits. Similarly, personal motivation or individual initiative is not a dominant factor unless supported by an enabling environment and adequate social capacity. Meanwhile, education level has a positive but non-significant influence. This shows that education is not the primary determinant of social entrepreneurial behavior. According to utilitarian theory, individuals with secondary education or less can still become social entrepreneurs if they perceive the social benefits and economic opportunities generated as outweighing the costs and risks involved. These findings reinforce the results of Hassan et al. (2022), which emphasize that non-formal education, work experience, and practical training are actually more influential on the ability to engage in sociopreneurship.

Overall, the results of this study confirm that the decision to become a sociopreneur is a rational choice within the framework of utility theory and neoclassical labor choice theory. Individuals tend to choose business activities that provide the highest total satisfaction, whether in the form of economic profit or social well-being. Factors such as training, community, labor, and local resources increase the utility derived from socio-economic activities, whereas variables such as technology and large capital do not always lead to maximum satisfaction. This finding has important implications for the development of sociopreneurship policies in tourism areas. Local governments need to strengthen support for entrepreneurship training, expand community networks, and encourage the use of local resources to create a balance between economic efficiency and social utility. Therefore, sociopreneurship can serve as a rational and sustainable mechanism in achieving economic and social welfare in the Borobudur National Strategic Tourism Area.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that individual decisions to become sociopreneurs in the Borobudur National Tourism Strategic Area are influenced by a combination of internal and external factors reflecting a balance between economic and social motives. Based on utility theory and neoclassical labor-choice theory, individuals rationally choose alternatives that provide the highest utility, not only financial gains but also social

satisfaction. The analysis results show that age, training, community participation, workforce, training background, and the availability of local resources positively influence the decision to become a sociopreneur, while technology use negatively influences it. Meanwhile, education, capital, gender, and initiative background do not have a significant effect, indicating that sociopreneurship decisions are more driven by social and environmental factors than by economics alone.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that local governments, training institutions, and entrepreneurship communities strengthen support for community-based training, increase access to local resources, and foster collaboration among social entrepreneurs. Developing policies that empower communities and foster social innovation should be a priority to create an inclusive and sustainable sociopreneurship ecosystem. By strengthening the community's social and collaborative capacity, sociopreneurship can play a strategic role in developing equitable, shared-prosperity local economies in tourism areas such as Borobudur.

Reference

- Ariski, Y., Muhtadi, Hermansyah, T., and Ratnasari, W. P. (2023). Kewirausahaan Sosial pada Sentra Budidaya dan Pengolahan Perikanan Air Tawar Si Pujuk Farm untuk Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat. *Journal of Social Development Studies*, 4(1), 192–206.
- Az, A. W., Izzuddin, A., and Rusdiyanto. (2023). Pengaruh Motivasi Terhadap Minat Mahasiswa Menjadi Start Up Entrepreneur Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember. *MASTER: Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Terapan*, 2(1), 1–12. www.mediaindonesia.com,
- Belmonte, Z. J. A., Cruz, C. S. C., Castro, P. A. P. De, Estoesta, L. A., Mitra, E. J. A., and Lira, P. E. V. R. (2022). Factors Influencing Technopreneurial Intention among Undergraduate Engineering Students in the Philippines. *Journal of Engineering Education Transformations*, 36(1), 148–157.
- Borjas, G. J. (2016). *Labor Economics* (Edisi ke-7). McGraw Hill Education.
- Brieger, S. A., B  ro, A., Criaco, G., and Terjesen, S. A. (2021). Entrepreneurs' Age, Institutions, and Social Value Creation Goals: A Multi-Country Study. *Journal Small Business Economics*, 57(1), 425–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-020-00317-z>
- Brixiova, Z., and Egert, B. (2017). *Entrepreneurship, Institutions and Skills in Low-Income Countries*. www.RePEc.org
- Coduras, A., Velilla, J., and Ortega, R. (2018). Age of The Entrepreneurial Decision: Differences Among Developed, Developing, and Non-Developed Countries. *Journal Economics and Business Letters*, 7(1), 36–46. <http://www.gemconsortium.org/about/wiki>
- Damayanti, N., and Harti. (2013). Perbedaan Jenis Kelamin Terhadap Minat Berwirausaha Mahasiswa Jurusan Pendidikan Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Surabaya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tata Niaga (JPTN)*, 1(3), 1–16.
- Defourny, J., and Nyssens, M. (2017). *Fundamentals for an International Typology of Social Enterprise Models* (33).
- Gunadi, R. A. A., Misriandi, Farihen, Yusuf, N., Sumardi, A., and Murdiratno, H. (2021). Sociopreneurship Pengolahan Sampah Organik Menjadi Pakan Ikan dan Pakan Ternak. *Junal Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat*, 5(3), 373–385.

- Hasniati, and Syahrudin. (2022). Pengaruh Motivasi dan Pengetahuan Kewirausahaan Terhadap Minat Berwirausaha. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ecosystem*, 22(3), 541–550.
- Hassan, H. M. K., Igel, B., and Shamsuddoha, M. (2022). Entrepreneurship Education and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions: The Mediating Effects of Entrepreneurial Social Network. *Journal Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.860273>
- Irawati, R. (2017). Pengambilan Keputusan Usaha Mandiri Mahasiswa Ditinjau dari Faktor Internal dan Eksternal. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bisnis Dan Ekonomi Asia*, 11(1), 58–69.
- Kasih, A. P. (2022). Sociopreneur Jadi Tren Karier Baru bagi Milenial dan Gen Z. *Kompas.Com*.
<https://www.kompas.com/edu/read/2022/05/23/093246971/sociopreneur-jadi-tren-karier-baru-bagi-milenial-dan-gen-z?page=all>
- Khan, N. U., Li, S., Safdar, M. N., and Khan, Z. U. (2019). The Role of Entrepreneurial Strategy, Network Ties, Human and Financial Capital in New Venture Performance. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm12010041>
- Mahendra, A. M., Djatmika, E. T., and Hermawan, A. (2017). The Effect of Entrepreneurship Education on Entrepreneurial Intention Mediated by Motivation and Attitude among Management Students, State University of Malang, Indonesia. *Journal International Education Studies*, 10(9), 61. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v10n9p61>
- Mankiw, N. G. (2018). *Principles of Microeconomics* (Edisi ke-8). Cengage Learning.
- Meifa, Y. T. (2022). Pengaruh Modal Usaha, Lingkungan dan Self Efficacy terhadap Minat Berwirausaha. *REVENUE: Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Islam*, 3(1), 43–64. <https://doi.org/10.24042/revenue.v3i1.10459>
- Nabi, G., Walmsley, A., Liñán, F., Akhtar, I., and Neame, C. (2018). Does Entrepreneurship Education In The First Year of Higher Education Develop Entrepreneurial Intentions? The Role of Learning and Inspiration. *Journal Studies in Higher Education*, 43(3), 452–467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1177716>
- Nasila, R., and Napu, I. A. (2024). Strategi Baru dalam Mendukung Kewirausahaan Sosial untuk Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat Marginal di Kabupaten Bone Bolango, Provinsi Gorontalo. *Journal of Education Research*, 5(4), 4853–4867.
- Nguyen, N. T. T., Tang, C. T., and Wong, C. Y. (2021). The impacts of social enterprises on labor market outcomes: Evidence from Vietnam. *Journal Sustainability*, 13(19), 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910864>
- Okthafiani, D., Mranani, M., and Pramita, Y. D. (2024, June 12). Pengaruh E-Commerce, Sosial Media, Penggunaan Sistem Informasi Akuntansi dan Pengetahuan Kewirausahaan Terhadap Pengambilan Keputusan Berwirausaha. *Business and Economics Conference in Utilization of Modern Technology*. <https://journal.unimma.ac.id>
- Panjawa, J. L., Ratnasari, E. D., Hutajulu, D. M., Samsudin, M., Lestari, P., Ernawati, D., and Purna, F. P. (2024). Investigating the Key Drivers of Career Selection in the Creative Economy Sector. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan: Kajian Masalah Ekonomi Dan Pembangunan*, 25(2), 315–338.

- Pujiastuti, N. S. (2022). Gerakan Sosial dan Wirausaha Sosial di Indonesia Dua Sisi yang Berbeda dalam Satu Tujuan. *Jurnal Cahaya Mandalika*, 3(2), 2216–2227.
- Purba, R. R., and Siregar, J. L. (2023). Perguruan Tinggi Sebagai Agen Perubahan Melalui Social Entrepreneurship Roberto. *Tour Abdimas Journal*, 2(1), 52–56.
- Putri, P. L., and Salsebela, R. N. (2025). Sociopreneur Muda: Program Pelatihan Kewirausahaan Sosial untuk Meningkatkan Jiwa Usaha dan Kepedulian Sosial Siswa SMA Islam Andalusia Kebasen. *ARDHI : Jurnal Pengabdian Dalam Negri*, 3(3), 270–282.
- Rahmi, N., and Rahmisyari. (2023). Peran Food Vlogger, Content Kreator Di Sosial Media dan Youtube Dalam Keputusan Berwirausaha Kuliner. *Jurnal Mirai Management*, 8(2), 246–253.
- Sunatar, B., Khoirunnisa, and Katmas, E. (2024). Pengaruh Kepribadian Dan Lingkungan Sosial Terhadap Keputusan Berwirausaha pada Mahasiswa Ekonomi Syariah Institut Agama Islam Negeri Sorong. *Journal of Economic, Management, and Accounting*, 7(1), 1–9.
- Sundari, M. E., and Lubis, I. (2024). Pengaruh Pendidikan Kewirausahaan, Latar Belakang Keluarga, dan Jenis Kelamin terhadap Minat Berwirausaha Mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Medan. *Attractive : Innovative Education Journal*, 6(3), 376–386. <https://www.attractivejournal.com/index.php/aj/>
- Susanti, M. (2021). Implementasi Sociopreneurship Berbasis Lingkungan Sebagai Reduksi Pengangguran Di Kota Mataram. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik Universitas Medan Area*, 9(1), 67–74.
- Tran, K. (2019, October 26). *The Best Country To Be A Social Entrepreneur In 2019*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/khaitran/2019/10/26/the-best-country-to-be-a-social-entrepreneur-in-2019/>
- Triyani, D., Sulistyawati, A. I., and Mulyantomo, E. (2021). Analisis Sikap, Norma Subyektif, Faktor Internal Dan Eskternal Dalam Membentuk Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Jurnal Manajemen Strategi Dan Aplikasi Bisnis*, 4(2), 471–483. <https://doi.org/10.36407/jmsab.v4i2.480>
- Uakarn, C., Chaokromthong, K., and Sintao, N. (2021). Sample Size Estimation using Yamane and Cochran and Krejcie and Morgan and Green Formulas and Cohen Statistical Power Analysis by G*Power and Comparisons. *Apheit International Journal*, 10(2), 79.
- Xu, Y., and Ye, X. (2021). Technology upgrading and labor degrading? A sociological study of three robotized factories. *Journal of Chinese Sociology*, 8(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40711-021-00154-x>
- Yuniasanti, R., Wicaksono, A. S., and Sari, D. S. (2024). Pelatihan dan Modul Sociopreneur Bagi Peningkatan Motivasi Sociopreneur untuk Pemberdayaan Wanita di Desa Hargorejo. *DedikasiMU (Journal of Community Service)*, 6(3), 389–398.
- Zenebe, A., Alsaaty, F. M., and Anyiwo, D. (2018). Relationship Between Individual's Entrepreneurship Intention, and Adoption and Knowledge of Information Technology and Its Applications: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 30(3), 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2017.1397441>