COMMUNITY-BASED ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND MSME RESILIENCE: BUILDING SUSTAINABLE LOCAL ECONOMIC ECOSYSTEMS

Nida Garnida Fitrianti[1], R.R. Fatmasari[2]
[1]Organisasi KRIEZ, Indonesia
[2]Yayasan KRIEZ, Indonesia

Abstract

Background: Micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) are central to local employment, household income, and the circulation of economic value, yet their resilience is frequently constrained by fragmented support, weak market linkages, limited managerial capability, and dependence on individual entrepreneurs. Community-based entrepreneurship offers a complementary perspective by locating enterprise development within social relationships, local institutions, shared resources, and place-based knowledge.

Aims: This article develops an integrative conceptual framework explaining how community-based entrepreneurship can strengthen MSME resilience and contribute to sustainable local economic ecosystems.

Research Method: The study uses an integrative conceptual review of established literature on community-based enterprise, entrepreneurial ecosystems, social capital, local economic development, and organizational resilience. It does not claim primary survey data, experimental evidence, or statistical estimates.

Results and Conclusion: The synthesis indicates that MSME resilience is strengthened when local entrepreneurial activity is supported by trusted networks, collective learning, market access, institutional coordination, resource diversification, and mechanisms that connect individual firms with community capabilities. Community embeddedness can reduce information gaps and transaction frictions, but excessive closure may also restrict innovation and external market access. Sustainable local ecosystems therefore require a balance between strong local ties and outward-facing connections.

Contribution: The paper proposes a Community-Based MSME Resilience Framework linking community assets, entrepreneurial coordination, ecosystem resources, adaptive capability, and sustainable local outcomes. It provides propositions and practical indicators for future empirical testing.

Keywords: Community-Based Entrepreneurship; MSMEs; Resilience; Entrepreneurial Ecosystem; Local Economic Development

INTRODUCTION

Micro, small, and medium enterprises are often discussed as individual business units, but their survival and development are deeply influenced by the places in which they operate. Local markets, family and community networks, suppliers, associations, educational institutions, financial organizations, local government, infrastructure, and cultural norms shape the opportunities and constraints faced by entrepreneurs. This embeddedness becomes especially visible during periods of disruption, when the ability of a firm to adapt may depend as much on relationships and local coordination as on its own financial resources.

Resilience has become an important lens for understanding how small firms respond to shocks, uncertainty, and structural change. For MSMEs, resilience is not simply the ability to return to a previous condition. It also includes the capacity to anticipate disruption, maintain essential activities, reorganize resources, learn from experience, and pursue new opportunities. Small firms may possess flexibility and close customer relationships, yet they can also be vulnerable because of limited cash reserves, concentrated markets, dependence on a few key people, and restricted access to information and finance.

Community-based entrepreneurship provides a useful conceptual foundation for addressing these conditions. Peredo and Chrisman (2006) describe community-based enterprise as an entrepreneurial form in which community resources, social structures, and collective interests are closely connected with economic activity. Their work emphasizes that economic, social, cultural, and natural capital may be integrated rather than treated as separate domains. This perspective is particularly relevant for local development because entrepreneurship can become a mechanism through which communities organize resources, create livelihoods, and retain value within a locality.

The entrepreneurial ecosystem literature offers a complementary perspective. Stam (2015) argues that entrepreneurship policy should move beyond isolated interventions and consider the systemic conditions that enable productive entrepreneurship. Spigel (2017) conceptualizes entrepreneurial ecosystems through cultural, social, and material attributes and emphasizes the relationships among them. Spigel and Harrison (2018) further develop a process perspective in which resources circulate through ecosystems and contribute to entrepreneurial activity. These ideas suggest that MSME resilience should not be analyzed only at the firm level.

For local economies, the practical challenge is to connect firm-level capability with community-level resources without assuming that all communities are homogeneous or that collective action is automatically beneficial. Local ties can create trust, facilitate information exchange, and support cooperation, but closed networks can also reinforce outdated practices, exclude outsiders, and limit exposure to new knowledge. A resilient local ecosystem therefore needs both bonding relationships that support trust and bridging relationships that connect firms to external markets, technologies, institutions, and finance.

This article addresses the question: how can community-based entrepreneurship contribute to MSME resilience and sustainable local economic development? The objective is to integrate community-based enterprise, entrepreneurial ecosystem, social-capital, and resilience perspectives into a practical conceptual framework. The article focuses on five mechanisms: mobilization of community assets, entrepreneurial coordination, knowledge and market connectivity, adaptive organizational capability, and local value circulation.

The article makes four contributions. First, it positions MSME resilience as an ecosystem outcome rather than solely an individual-firm characteristic. Second, it distinguishes community embeddedness from community closure and explains why outward connectivity remains essential. Third, it proposes a sequential framework from community assets to entrepreneurial coordination, adaptive capability, and sustainable local outcomes. Fourth, it offers practical indicators that can guide future empirical research and local development programs.

RESEARCH METHOD

This paper adopts an integrative conceptual review. The purpose is to synthesize established theoretical perspectives that are relevant to community-based entrepreneurship, MSME resilience, entrepreneurial ecosystems, social capital, and sustainable local development. An integrative approach is appropriate because the research problem spans several literatures that use different units of analysis, including the entrepreneur, the firm, the community, and the regional ecosystem.

The review does not claim to be a systematic review, meta-analysis, or bibliometric census. No fabricated database counts, screening diagrams, respondent data, interviews, or statistical results are presented. Sources were selected for conceptual relevance, scholarly traceability, and their contribution to the mechanisms examined in the framework. Particular attention was given to work published before the June 2024 issue placement of this article.

The analytical process followed four steps. First, the concepts of community-based enterprise, entrepreneurial ecosystem, social capital, local economic development, and resilience were separated to avoid conceptual overlap. Second, recurring mechanisms were identified, including trust, collective resource mobilization, knowledge exchange, institutional support, market connectivity, and adaptive learning. Third, tensions and boundary conditions were examined, especially the risks of network closure, dependence, unequal participation, and weak external linkages. Fourth, the mechanisms were assembled into a Community-Based MSME Resilience Framework.

Because the article is conceptual, the results consist of synthesized relationships, propositions, and practical implications rather than empirical estimates. Future research should test the framework using transparent sampling, appropriate ethical procedures, and context-sensitive quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods. This distinction is important for maintaining academic integrity and for preventing conceptual arguments from being interpreted as findings from data that were not collected.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

COMMUNITY-BASED ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS A LOCAL DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

Community-based entrepreneurship differs from a narrow view of entrepreneurship centered exclusively on the autonomous individual. The community may provide resources, legitimacy, knowledge, labor, market relationships, identity, and informal governance that make enterprise activity possible. In this setting, entrepreneurship can create private income while also producing collective benefits such as employment, local services, skill development, and stronger economic circulation.

Peredo and Chrisman (2006) argue that community-based enterprise can emerge where communities mobilize social, cultural, natural, and economic resources in response to local conditions. The relevance for MSMEs is not that every small firm must become collectively owned. Rather, individual MSMEs can operate within a community-based entrepreneurial system in which shared institutions and relationships increase the productive capacity of firms.

Local embeddedness can reduce several constraints faced by small enterprises. Trusted relationships may lower information and coordination costs. Local knowledge can improve product adaptation and customer understanding. Associations can aggregate demand for training, logistics, technology, or finance. Community institutions can help identify credible partners and communicate opportunities. These mechanisms are particularly important where formal market-support institutions are limited or difficult for microenterprises to access.

However, community orientation should not be romanticized. Collective arrangements can reproduce unequal power, restrict participation, or prioritize established actors. Informal norms may discourage experimentation. Strong internal relationships can become a source of rigidity if firms lack access to external knowledge. The value of community-based entrepreneurship therefore depends on governance, inclusion, and the capacity to connect local resources with wider markets.

ENTREPRENEURIAL ECOSYSTEMS AND THE POSITION OF MSMES

Entrepreneurial ecosystem research shifts attention from individual support programs to the relationships among entrepreneurs, institutions, finance, talent, culture, markets, and infrastructure. Stam (2015) emphasizes that entrepreneurial activity emerges from systemic conditions, while Spigel (2017) highlights the cultural, social, and material attributes that provide resources to entrepreneurs. These perspectives are useful for MSMEs because many constraints are relational rather than purely internal.

An MSME may possess a viable product but lack distribution relationships. Another may have market demand but insufficient working capital. A third may have finance but limited managerial knowledge. When support is fragmented, entrepreneurs must solve each constraint separately. A functioning ecosystem reduces this fragmentation by creating pathways through which firms can reach relevant resources.

Spigel and Harrison (2018) emphasize ecosystem processes and resource flows. From a resilience perspective, this implies that the availability of resources is less important than the ability of entrepreneurs to access, recombine, and redeploy them. A training institution that is disconnected from local business needs may contribute little. A financing program that does not understand cash-flow cycles may create repayment pressure rather than resilience. Ecosystem quality is therefore reflected in coordination and fit.

For community-based MSME development, the ecosystem should operate at multiple scales. Local networks provide proximity, trust, and contextual knowledge. Regional and national networks provide larger markets, specialized expertise, finance, and technological opportunities. Digital platforms can extend these connections further. The central design challenge is to preserve the advantages of local embeddedness while avoiding economic isolation.

SOCIAL CAPITAL, TRUST, AND COLLECTIVE CAPABILITY

Social capital is one of the main mechanisms connecting community relationships with entrepreneurial outcomes. Trust can facilitate exchange when formal contracts are costly or incomplete. Repeated interaction can improve information about reliability and competence. Shared norms can support collective action such as joint promotion, shared facilities, training, procurement, or local events.

For MSMEs, social capital can function as a form of operating infrastructure. Entrepreneurs often obtain information about suppliers, customers, employees, financing, regulations, and technology through relationships. During disruption, trusted networks may accelerate access to alternative inputs, temporary labor, market information, or emergency assistance. These benefits can improve response speed when formal support is slow.

Yet social capital has different forms. Bonding capital refers to strong ties within relatively close groups, while bridging capital connects actors across different networks. Bonding ties can support trust and mutual assistance, but bridging ties are important for new information and external opportunities. A resilient entrepreneurial community requires both. Excessive dependence on bonding ties can create redundancy in information and reduce exposure to innovation.

Governance affects whether social capital becomes productive. Transparent membership rules, clear decision processes, conflict-management mechanisms, and accountability can prevent collective initiatives from being captured by a small group. Community-based entrepreneurship should therefore be understood as organized capability, not merely social closeness.

FROM COMMUNITY ASSETS TO MSME RESILIENCE

The proposed framework begins with community assets. These include human skills, entrepreneurial experience, social networks, local institutions, cultural identity, natural resources where relevant, infrastructure, and access to digital connectivity. Assets do not automatically generate resilience. They become productive when actors can identify, coordinate, and combine them.

The second stage is entrepreneurial coordination. Coordination includes associations, cooperatives, business communities, local government facilitation, university partnerships, mentoring relationships, financial linkages, and other mechanisms that connect firms with resources. Coordination reduces search costs and can make support more responsive to actual business problems.

The third stage is resource access and recombination. MSMEs need to convert ecosystem connections into usable inputs: market information, finance, technology, skills, suppliers, distribution, and partnerships. Resilience depends on having alternatives rather than a single fragile dependency. A business with several credible suppliers or sales channels has more options when conditions change.

The fourth stage is adaptive organizational capability. External resources create value only when firms can use them. Adaptive capability includes financial discipline, learning routines, customer responsiveness, experimentation, operational flexibility, and the ability to reconfigure resources. Community support cannot substitute for internal management, but it can expand the range of options available to management.

The fifth stage is resilient and sustainable local performance. At the firm level, outcomes include continuity, liquidity, market retention, recovery speed, innovation, and sustainable growth. At the community level, outcomes include employment, local value circulation, enterprise diversity, skill development, and reduced vulnerability to the failure of a single employer or sector.

A COMMUNITY-BASED MSME RESILIENCE FRAMEWORK

The framework proposes that community assets influence MSME resilience through entrepreneurial coordination, ecosystem resource access, and adaptive capability. The relationship is not linear in all contexts. Institutional quality, inclusiveness, digital connectivity, market openness, and leadership influence how effectively resources move through the system.

Community embeddedness is expected to have its strongest positive effect when local ties are combined with bridging connections. Strong internal networks can support trust and rapid mobilization, while external networks provide novelty, specialized resources, and larger markets. The framework therefore treats openness as a resilience condition rather than a threat to community identity.

Resource diversity is another important condition. A local economy dominated by one buyer, platform, sector, or financing source can remain vulnerable even when social cohesion is high. Diversification across markets, suppliers, knowledge sources, and financing options creates strategic alternatives. The objective is not maximum diversification, which may be costly, but proportionate reduction of critical dependencies.

Finally, the framework recognizes feedback effects. Successful resilient MSMEs can strengthen the ecosystem by mentoring new entrepreneurs, creating demand for local suppliers, supporting associations, contributing knowledge, and demonstrating viable business models. Resilience can therefore become cumulative when successful firms reinvest capabilities into the local entrepreneurial system.

Table 1. Community-Based MSME Resilience Framework

Stage	Core Resource/Capability	Illustrative Mechanism	Expected Resilience Effect
1. Community Assets	Skills, trust, institutions, identity, infrastructure	Mapping local capabilities and critical gaps	Stronger local resource base
2. Entrepreneurial Coordination	Associations, partnerships, intermediaries	Connecting MSMEs with finance, training, markets, and peers	Lower search and coordination costs
3. Resource Access and Recombination	Market, finance, knowledge, technology, suppliers	Combining local and external resources	More strategic alternatives
4. Adaptive Capability	Learning, flexibility, financial discipline, experimentation	Reconfiguring operations when conditions change	Faster adaptation and recovery
5. Sustainable Local Outcomes	Continuity, diversity, employment, local value circulation	Reinvestment of knowledge and economic value	Firm and community resilience

BALANCING LOCAL EMBEDDEDNESS AND EXTERNAL CONNECTIVITY

Local embeddedness creates advantages when entrepreneurs understand community needs and can rely on trusted relationships. Products may be adapted to local preferences, information can circulate rapidly, and cooperation can be organized with relatively low transaction costs. These advantages can support early-stage entrepreneurship and help firms remain connected to customers during disruption.

Nevertheless, resilience requires access to information and opportunities beyond the immediate community. External connections can introduce new technologies, management practices, financing options, standards, and market opportunities. Spigel's (2017) relational perspective is relevant because ecosystem resources gain value through relationships rather than through their mere presence.

Bridging organizations are therefore important. Universities, chambers, associations, cooperatives, development agencies, digital communities, and anchor firms can connect local MSMEs with wider networks. Their role is not to replace entrepreneurs but to reduce structural gaps between local capability and external opportunity.

A practical implication is that local development programs should measure network reach as well as participation. A community may have many meetings and organizations but still remain economically isolated. Indicators such as new buyer relationships, external mentoring, interregional partnerships, supplier diversification, and access to specialized knowledge provide a better picture of outward connectivity.

MARKET ACCESS AND LOCAL VALUE CIRCULATION

Market access is a central resilience mechanism because enterprises cannot sustain employment or investment without reliable demand. Community-based entrepreneurship can create initial markets through local purchasing, collective branding, events, tourism, or shared distribution. However, local demand alone may be insufficient for growth, especially in communities with limited purchasing power.

Collective market development can help MSMEs reach larger customers. Shared promotion, quality standards, packaging support, logistics coordination, and digital catalogues can reduce the cost of entering new markets. Business associations can also aggregate information about buyer requirements and help firms prepare for procurement opportunities.

Local value circulation is distinct from economic isolation. The objective is to increase the proportion of economic activity that creates durable local capability. When local firms purchase from one another where competitive, employ local workers, develop local suppliers, and reinvest profits in productive activity, economic value can circulate through the community before leaking outward.

At the same time, firms should remain free to source externally when local options are unavailable or uncompetitive. Sustainable local development depends on capability improvement rather than protection from competition. Community-based entrepreneurship should therefore encourage local supplier development while exposing firms to market standards that promote productivity.

FINANCE, RESOURCE SHARING, AND RISK DIVERSIFICATION

Financial constraints are a persistent challenge for MSMEs, but community-based approaches can improve the quality of financial access. Collective financial education, savings mechanisms, cooperatives, credit groups, and partnerships with formal institutions can reduce information gaps and help entrepreneurs understand financing options. The objective should be productive finance aligned with business cash flows rather than credit expansion for its own sake.

Resource sharing can also reduce capital requirements. Shared production facilities, equipment, storage, training spaces, logistics, or digital services may allow small firms to access capabilities that would be inefficient to purchase individually. Such arrangements require clear rules for access, maintenance, pricing, responsibility, and dispute resolution.

Risk diversification should be built into local enterprise development. Communities that depend heavily on one commodity, tourism season, platform, buyer, or employer are exposed to concentrated shocks. Entrepreneurial diversity across sectors and customer groups can create stabilizing effects. Within firms, diversified sales channels, supplier alternatives, and financing sources can reduce operational vulnerability.

Collective mechanisms should not eliminate individual accountability. Shared facilities can fail when ownership responsibilities are unclear, and community finance can create social pressure if repayment standards are weak. Effective governance combines solidarity with transparent economic rules.

DIGITAL CONNECTIVITY AS AN ECOSYSTEM BRIDGE

Digital technology can extend community-based entrepreneurship beyond geographic proximity. Messaging platforms, digital marketplaces, online training, digital payments, and social media can connect local MSMEs with customers, mentors, suppliers, and information. For remote or resource-constrained communities, digital connectivity can reduce some disadvantages of distance.

Digitalization also creates new dependencies. Platform fees, algorithm changes, account restrictions, cybersecurity risks, and uneven digital skills can affect enterprise continuity. A resilient ecosystem should therefore treat digital capability as a shared development priority rather than assume that access to smartphones automatically creates digital competitiveness.

Community organizations can support digital capability through practical training, peer learning, shared content production, digital catalogues, and assistance with business records. More advanced firms can mentor newer users. Universities and technology partners can help translate digital tools into specific business processes rather than providing generic technology demonstrations.

The strongest model is hybrid. Local relationships provide trust and context, while digital networks provide scale and external connectivity. Combining the two can help MSMEs retain community identity while participating in broader markets.

INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND LOCAL GOVERNANCE

Entrepreneurial ecosystems often contain many organizations with overlapping mandates. Local governments, financial institutions, universities, business associations, cooperatives, community organizations, and private platforms may all offer support. Without coordination, MSMEs can face duplicated training, fragmented information, and programs that do not address their most binding constraints.

Local governance should begin with a shared diagnosis of enterprise needs. Rather than measuring success only by the number of participants, programs should identify constraints related to markets, finance, productivity, skills, technology, infrastructure, or regulation. Different actors can then contribute according to their comparative strengths.

Intermediary organizations can play an orchestration role by maintaining information about available support, referring firms to relevant services, and collecting feedback. This function is particularly useful for microenterprises that lack time to navigate complex institutional structures.

Accountability is essential. Community-based programs should disclose selection criteria, responsibilities, funding arrangements, and expected outcomes. Transparent governance reduces the risk that benefits are concentrated among well-connected participants and helps maintain trust in collective initiatives.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

MSME managers should map the ecosystem around their businesses. A practical map includes customers, suppliers, financial institutions, peer entrepreneurs, associations, training providers, local government, digital platforms, logistics partners, and potential mentors. The purpose is to identify both available resources and dangerous dependencies.

Managers should distinguish supportive relationships from strategic alternatives. A strong relationship with one buyer can be valuable, but resilience requires knowing what happens if that buyer reduces orders. The same logic applies to suppliers, platforms, lenders, and key employees. Critical dependencies should have proportionate contingency options.

Participation in community networks should be purposeful. Meetings and memberships create value when they improve information, market access, learning, cooperation, or representation. Managers can periodically evaluate which relationships generate useful knowledge and which require additional bridging connections.

Financial and operational records remain essential even in trust-based environments. Community relationships can facilitate cooperation, but reliable records support pricing, credit decisions, inventory management, tax compliance, and negotiations. Professional management strengthens rather than weakens community-based entrepreneurship.

Finally, resilient entrepreneurs should contribute back to the ecosystem when feasible. Mentoring, supplier development, knowledge sharing, internships, and participation in associations can strengthen the resource base on which all local firms depend.

POLICY AND ECOSYSTEM IMPLICATIONS

Local economic policy should move from isolated entrepreneurship events toward ecosystem capability. Training is useful when it is connected with finance, markets, mentoring, technology, and follow-up. A sequence of support is more likely to create durable capability than disconnected short-term interventions.

Programs should differentiate among MSMEs. Subsistence microenterprises, growth-oriented firms, creative businesses, rural producers, service firms, and small manufacturers face different constraints. Ecosystem design should provide common infrastructure while allowing targeted pathways based on firm needs and readiness.

Community organizations can serve as trusted intermediaries, but they should be connected to professional and external institutions. Partnerships with universities can support research and training; financial institutions can improve financing pathways; larger firms can support supplier development; and digital platforms can extend market access.

Evaluation should include resilience and local development outcomes. Useful indicators include business continuity, market diversification, financing quality, supplier alternatives, recovery time after disruption, employment stability, new collaborations, participation of women and young entrepreneurs, and the proportion of firms using reliable financial and operational records.

Policy should also monitor unintended effects. Collective programs can create dependence on subsidies, reinforce local elites, or encourage firms to remain in low-productivity activities. The objective should be to increase agency, capability, and market competitiveness rather than maintain permanent program dependence.

RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

P1. Community asset mobilization is positively associated with MSME resilience when assets are connected to entrepreneurial coordination mechanisms.

P2. Entrepreneurial coordination mediates the relationship between community embeddedness and MSME access to market, knowledge, finance, and technology resources.

P3. Bridging connections to external actors strengthen the positive relationship between local social capital and MSME innovation capability.

P4. Resource diversification strengthens the relationship between ecosystem participation and MSME resilience.

P5. Adaptive organizational capability mediates the relationship between ecosystem resource access and sustainable MSME performance.

P6. Inclusive and transparent local governance strengthens the positive effect of community-based entrepreneurship on local economic outcomes.

Future studies can test these propositions using multilevel designs that distinguish firm-level and community-level effects. Longitudinal research would be particularly valuable because ecosystem capability and resilience develop over time. Researchers can compare communities with different institutional arrangements, degrees of digital connectivity, sector structures, and exposure to shocks.

Measurement should combine objective and perceptual indicators. Firm-level measures can include sales continuity, liquidity, employment, supplier concentration, customer concentration, recovery time, and innovation activity. Ecosystem measures can include network diversity, frequency of interorganizational collaboration, access to external markets, participation in support programs, and the presence of effective intermediaries.

Qualitative research can examine how trust, leadership, conflict, and informal norms influence collective entrepreneurship. Such studies are important because similar formal institutions can produce different outcomes depending on local relationships and history. Mixed-method approaches can connect these mechanisms with measurable enterprise outcomes.

PRACTICAL MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK

A practical measurement framework should distinguish inputs, processes, capabilities, and outcomes. Inputs include local skills, organizations, infrastructure, finance, and digital access. Process indicators include referrals, mentoring, joint activities, supplier development, and collaboration across institutions. Capability indicators include market knowledge, financial management, innovation routines, contingency planning, and digital competence. Outcomes include continuity, diversification, employment, productivity, and local value creation.

Network quality can be assessed through diversity rather than size alone. An entrepreneur with many contacts from the same circle may have less access to new information than an entrepreneur with fewer but more diverse relationships. Measures should therefore capture links to customers, suppliers, financial institutions, universities, government, peer firms, and actors outside the locality.

Resilience measurement should also include preparedness. Waiting until a disruption occurs can make evaluation difficult. Firms can be assessed on whether they maintain financial records, identify critical dependencies, hold contingency liquidity where feasible, maintain supplier alternatives, protect digital access, and document essential operating procedures.

At the community level, enterprise diversity is a useful indicator. A local economy with firms across several sectors and market channels may be better able to absorb sector-specific shocks. Researchers should nevertheless account for local comparative advantage; diversification should complement rather than arbitrarily replace productive specialization.

LOCAL LEARNING, INNOVATION, AND ENTREPRENEURIAL RENEWAL

Resilience requires more than protecting existing business routines. Local economies change as consumer preferences, technologies, regulations, and competitive conditions evolve. Community-based entrepreneurship can support renewal when local networks become channels for learning rather than mechanisms for preserving established practices. Entrepreneurs need opportunities to observe new business models, discuss failures, compare operating methods, and experiment with adaptations that fit local conditions.

Peer learning is particularly relevant for MSMEs because formal consulting and specialized training can be expensive. Entrepreneurs often learn through observation, supplier relationships, customer feedback, and interaction with other business owners. Community organizations can make this informal learning more systematic by organizing problem-solving sessions, mentoring circles, demonstrations, and cross-sector exchanges. The value of these activities depends on whether they address actual operating problems and lead to changes in business practice.

Innovation within community-based entrepreneurship should be interpreted broadly. It may involve a new product, but it can also include improved packaging, a different sales channel, a more reliable bookkeeping routine, shared logistics, new supplier arrangements, digital customer communication, or a revised service process. Incremental innovations can be highly significant for small firms because they improve efficiency and adaptability without requiring large research and development budgets.

External knowledge remains essential. Universities, vocational institutions, professional associations, technology providers, and experienced firms can expose local entrepreneurs to practices that are not already present within the community. Effective intermediaries translate this knowledge into forms that MSMEs can apply. The objective is not to copy external models mechanically, but to combine outside knowledge with local experience and resources.

Entrepreneurial renewal also requires tolerance for experimentation. Community environments with strong social expectations may unintentionally discourage entrepreneurs from departing from established practices. Local institutions can reduce this barrier by legitimizing experimentation, sharing examples of responsible innovation, and creating low-risk opportunities to test new ideas. Small pilots can generate evidence before firms commit substantial resources.

Learning should be cumulative. Programs that end when a workshop is completed lose much of their potential value. Follow-up mentoring, peer accountability, business-record review, and repeated market feedback can help entrepreneurs convert information into capability. Over time, experienced participants can become mentors, creating a local stock of practical knowledge that strengthens the ecosystem.

RESILIENCE ACROSS DISRUPTION, RECOVERY, AND ADAPTATION

A useful resilience framework should distinguish among preparation, response, recovery, and adaptation. Before disruption, firms can identify critical dependencies, maintain basic records, build trusted relationships, and establish alternative contacts. During disruption, the priority shifts to maintaining essential cash flows, communicating with customers and suppliers, protecting employees, and accessing reliable information. Recovery involves restoring operations and rebuilding financial capacity. Adaptation occurs when firms change products, channels, processes, or partnerships in response to lessons from the disruption.

Community networks can contribute differently at each stage. In preparation, they support information sharing and joint planning. During response, they can help identify emergency suppliers, temporary market channels, or available assistance. During recovery, they can coordinate promotion, training, finance referrals, and shared resources. During adaptation, they can connect entrepreneurs with new knowledge and external partners. This stage-based perspective helps prevent resilience programs from being reduced to emergency assistance alone.

Recovery speed should not be the only measure of success. A firm can reopen quickly while remaining financially fragile or dependent on temporary support. Sustainable recovery requires restoring viable cash flows, rebuilding working capital, retaining productive relationships, and reducing vulnerabilities revealed by the disruption. Community-based mechanisms are most valuable when they help enterprises move from short-term survival toward stronger operating capability.

The framework also recognizes that not every enterprise should return to its previous model. Structural change may make some products, technologies, or market channels less viable. Resilience can therefore include responsible transformation, business-model adjustment, or movement into new opportunities. Ecosystem support should help entrepreneurs evaluate these choices rather than assume that preservation of the pre-disruption business is always the optimal outcome.

LIMITATIONS OF THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The framework has several limitations. First, community boundaries are not always clear. Entrepreneurs may participate simultaneously in geographic, professional, digital, ethnic, sectoral, and organizational communities. Future research should specify which community is analytically relevant rather than assume that administrative boundaries represent actual economic networks.

Second, the framework emphasizes positive mechanisms but recognizes that community structures can generate exclusion, conflict, and dependence. Empirical research should examine who participates, who controls resources, and who benefits from collective initiatives. Gender, age, socioeconomic position, and institutional power may influence access to ecosystem resources.

Third, resilience outcomes depend on the type and scale of disruption. Capabilities that help a firm manage a temporary demand shock may differ from those required for technological disruption or long-term structural decline. Future studies should define resilience in relation to specific threats and time horizons.

Fourth, the framework does not assume that stronger community embeddedness is always better. The optimal balance between local ties and external connectivity will vary by sector, firm maturity, market structure, and location. This boundary condition should be tested rather than treated as a universal prescription.

CONCLUSION

Community-based entrepreneurship provides a valuable perspective for understanding MSME resilience because small firms operate within networks of relationships, institutions, resources, and place-based knowledge. Firm capability remains essential, but resilience is strengthened when entrepreneurs can mobilize community assets, reach ecosystem resources, learn collectively, diversify critical dependencies, and connect local strengths with external opportunities.

The proposed Community-Based MSME Resilience Framework describes a pathway from community assets to entrepreneurial coordination, resource access and recombination, adaptive organizational capability, and sustainable local outcomes. The framework also emphasizes two conditions: local embeddedness should be balanced with outward connectivity, and collective action should be supported by inclusive and transparent governance.

For MSME managers, the central implication is to manage relationships and ecosystem resources as deliberately as internal operations. For community organizations and policymakers, the implication is to build coordinated pathways that connect entrepreneurs with markets, finance, knowledge, technology, and peers. For researchers, the framework provides propositions and indicators that can be tested across different Indonesian and international local contexts.

Sustainable local economic development is unlikely to result from increasing the number of enterprises alone. It depends on whether enterprises become capable, connected, adaptive, and able to contribute value back to the ecosystems in which they operate. Community-based entrepreneurship can support this process when collective strengths are combined with professional management and external market connectivity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

No funding source or institutional acknowledgment is stated in this manuscript. Any acknowledgment, funding disclosure, conflict-of-interest statement, and author-contribution statement should be completed only after confirmation by the actual contributors.

REFERENCES

Adger, W. N. (2000). Social and ecological resilience: Are they related? Progress in Human Geography, 24(3), 347-364. https://doi.org/10.1191/030913200701540465

Cantner, U., Cunningham, J. A., Lehmann, E. E., & Menter, M. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystems: A dynamic lifecycle model. Small Business Economics, 57, 407-423. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-020-00316-0

Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. American Journal of Sociology, 91(3), 481-510. https://doi.org/10.1086/228311

Isenberg, D. J. (2010). How to start an entrepreneurial revolution. Harvard Business Review, 88(6), 40-50.

Korsgaard, S., Müller, S., & Tanvig, H. W. (2015). Rural entrepreneurship or entrepreneurship in the rural - between place and space. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 21(1), 5-26. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-11-2013-0205

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. Human Resource Management Review, 21(3), 243-255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001

Peredo, A. M., & Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. Academy of Management Review, 31(2), 309-328. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.20208683

Roundy, P. T., Bradshaw, M., & Brockman, B. K. (2018). The emergence of entrepreneurial ecosystems: A complex adaptive systems approach. Journal of Business Research, 86, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.01.032

Shepherd, D. A., & Williams, T. A. (2014). Local venturing as compassion organizing in the aftermath of a natural disaster: The role of localness and community in reducing suffering. Journal of Management Studies, 51(6), 952-994. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12084

Spigel, B. (2017). The relational organization of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41(1), 49-72. https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12167

Spigel, B., & Harrison, R. (2018). Toward a process theory of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 12(1), 151-168. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1268

Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique. European Planning Studies, 23(9), 1759-1769. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2015.1061484

Williams, T. A., & Shepherd, D. A. (2016). Building resilience or providing sustenance: Different paths of emergent ventures in the aftermath of the Haiti earthquake. Academy of Management Journal, 59(6), 2069-2102. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0682