

Institutional Social Innovation of Community Empowerment Agency in Urban Coastal Community Development: A Study in Tanah Kalikedinding Subdistrict, Surabaya

Abdus Salam¹, Iradhad Taqwa Sihidi², Lintang Masitha³, Yudhistira Ananta⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Muhammadiyah University of Malang, Indonesia

¹Brawijaya University, Indonesia



DOI : <https://doi.org/10.61796/ijeirc.v3i9.548>



Sections Info

Article history:

Submitted: July 20, 2026

Final Revised: August 15, 2026

Accepted: September 03, 2026

Published: September 30, 2026

Keywords:

BKM

Social innovation

Community institutions

Coastal communities

Surabaya

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study analyzes the institutional social innovation of the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM) in Tanah Kalikedinding Village, Kenjeran District, Surabaya City, which has persisted after the end of the PNPM Mandiri Urban/KOTAKU program. The background of the study stems from the complexity of social, economic, environmental, and population density issues in urban coastal areas that require strengthening community-based institutions. The study aims to analyze the capacity of BKM in developing institutional social innovation, identifying implemented strategies, and formulating the direction of an adaptive, participatory, and sustainable institutional model. **Method:** The study used a qualitative approach with data collection through in-depth interviews with BKM administrators, community leaders, and beneficiaries, observations of institutional activities, and document reviews. Data were analyzed thematically by mapping the forms of innovation, institutional strategies, socio-economic contributions, and factors supporting and inhibiting the innovation's sustainability. **Results:** The results show that BKM continues to carry out its social function post-program and has begun developing cooperatives as business units to support productive community economic activities while strengthening institutional financial independence. However, strengthening innovation still faces limitations in synergy with the village government and access to some institutional documents. **Novelty:** These findings form the initial basis for developing an institutional social innovation model that relies on the sustainability of community institutions, citizen participation, strengthening the productive economy, and collaboration with local stakeholders.

INTRODUCTION

Surabaya is a key location for economic growth and urban activity in Indonesia, experiencing continuous progress in infrastructure, land use, and economic activities. However, this progress does not automatically address social issues and development inequities at the local level. Urban growth continues to be accompanied by challenges such as overcrowding, limited basic services, social vulnerability, and the need for increasingly complex environmental planning[1], [2], [3]. This situation shows that urban development cannot be understood solely through indicators of economic growth and physical development, but must also be seen in terms of how well the government and society strive to build an urban environment that is inclusive, sustainable, and responsive to the needs of its citizens [4].

The complexity of this development becomes even more apparent in urban coastal areas. Coastal areas face not only socioeconomic challenges but also environmental pressures and changes in land use that can exacerbate community vulnerability. Research

on the coastal areas of Surabaya shows that changes in coastal areas have social and economic impacts on the lives of the people living there[5], [6] [7]. Therefore, developing urban coastal communities requires an approach that focuses not only on infrastructure development but also considers aspects of social capacity, citizen participation, strengthening the local economy, and the ability of community institutions to cope with change.

One of the community organizations that plays a crucial role in urban community-based development is the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM). BKM emerged within the context of urban community empowerment through the PNPM Mandiri Urban Program and has since evolved into various institutions involved in slum management programs, including KOTAKU.[8], [9]Conceptually, the existence of BKM is focused on strengthening the position of the community as an agent of development through community organization, resource management, and implementation of activities aimed at improving the social and economic conditions of the community[10], [11], [12]. Over time, the existence of BKM can be understood not only from an administrative perspective, but also from its ability to maintain the institution and develop activities following changes in intervention programs.

The issue becomes interesting when the BKM institution continues to exist even though the government program that underpinned its formation has changed or ended. This continuity raises questions about whether the BKM merely remains as an institutional structure of an existing program or has transformed into a community institution capable of developing new functions according to community needs. Research on the dynamics and independence of BKM groups in the KOTAKU program indicates that the issue of institutional continuity is a crucial aspect in understanding the position of BKM after program intervention. Therefore, a study of BKM [13], [14], [15], [16], [16], [17]. After the program needs to be carried out not only based on the sustainability of the organization, but also the ability of the BKM institution to create new social and economic values for the community.

This perspective becomes even more crucial when institutional sustainability is linked to the concept of social innovation. Social innovation is fundamentally not just about creating something completely new, but also about the ability of community actors to develop new methods, relationships, or institutions to address social problems faced by the community. Research from McGuirk et al. [18] on grassroots innovation demonstrates that social innovation can emerge from the grassroots level when communities create solutions based on local needs and resources. In urban contexts, innovation can also grow through incremental, flexible, and multi-stakeholder management. Thus, change does not always occur through major reforms, but can emerge through experimentation and gradual adjustment.

From this perspective, the post-program existence of BKM can be seen as a more complex institutional phenomenon than simply organizational continuity. BKM serves as a forum for the community to increase collective capacity, manage resources, and create new activities with social and economic value. This process is related to the

institutionalization of public innovation, where innovation does not simply occur as a temporary activity or project, but seeks to acquire an institutional form that supports long-term sustainability [19]. On the other hand, the success of community-based innovation is greatly influenced by the opportunities for participation and the ability of citizens to engage in the development process, because participation is a key element in creating inclusive urban development [20].

Suyatna and Yuda [21] explains that institutionalized social entrepreneurship (ISE) plays a crucial role in providing social welfare amidst the decentralization process in Indonesia. Social entrepreneurship is not only oriented towards creating economic value but also serves as a mechanism to encourage innovation, strengthen institutional capacity, and respond to community needs. In the context of decentralization, the involvement of local governments, social organizations, and community actors becomes increasingly important in building collaboration in the provision of social services. Institutionalizing social entrepreneurship can thus strengthen the sustainability of social innovation and increase the capacity of local actors to meet community welfare needs more adaptively.

Salam et al.[22] demonstrates that social innovation in tourism village development can be strengthened through an Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) approach. This approach places local community assets, potential, and capacity as the primary foundation for tourism development. These findings demonstrate that active community involvement can foster more participatory, independent, and sustainable tourism village management, particularly through leveraging local potential as a source of innovation and strengthening the community's economy.

This phenomenon aligns with studies on social innovation that highlight the importance of local institutional capacity to link social issues with resource development and community economic activities. Diesch and Massari [4], for example, illustrates that the potential of an area can be increased through the linkages between place, community, and social innovation. On the other hand, research from Hon Chan and Chui[23] about social innovation policy shows that innovation can function as a tool for change if it is able to link community needs with reform processes in services and institutions. In the Indonesian context, the process of institutionalizing public innovation also indicates that the sustainability of innovation is highly dependent on its ability to gain support and integrate with institutional practices.[24].

Salam et al.[25] explains that social capital plays a crucial role in supporting the successful implementation of the resilient village program. Trust, social networks, norms, and cooperation among community members are factors that strengthen collective capacity in facing various challenges. A study in Jetak Lor Hamlet, Malang Regency, showed that utilizing social capital can increase community participation while strengthening coordination between the community and the government in realizing more resilient and sustainable village development.

However, the sustainability and innovation of the BKM institution are not without challenges. This study shows that collaboration between the BKM and the village

government is still not fully effective. This situation results in limited access to some institutional documents and a less-than-optimal clarification process regarding BKM policies and activities after the program concludes. This situation suggests that internal community capacity alone is insufficient to ensure the sustainability of innovation. Social innovation requires an institutional environment that supports communication, collaboration, access to resources, and recognition of the roles of community actors. The perspective on innovative urban governance emphasizes that innovation often emerges through relationships between actors and a gradual process of negotiation to address local issues [26].

To date, studies on BKM have focused more on program implementation, institutional dynamics, resource management, community participation, and group independence. A study by Ahmadi and Madarisa [9] specifically discusses the dynamics and independence of the BKM group within the framework of the KOTAKU program. This research is important for understanding how the BKM institution develops within the context of the empowerment program. However, research on BKM can still be expanded by exploring the situation that occurs when the institution must survive after the government program that was the basis of its intervention is no longer the main focus. The question that then arises is not only whether BKM continues to exist, but also how BKM develops new roles, strategies, and activities to remain relevant to the community.

This study views the BKM not only as an institutional legacy of government programs, but also as a place where institutional transformation occurs, enabling community-based social innovation. This approach provides a conceptual contribution by linking three elements that have often been discussed separately: community institutional sustainability, social innovation, and community development in urban coastal areas. From an empirical perspective, this study describes how the BKM Tanah Kalikedinding maintains its sustainability, develops cooperatives as economic entities, and addresses challenges in collaborating with local governments. Thus, this study aims to deepen understanding of how community institutions can transform from program implementers to players capable of initiating and sustaining social innovation.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study applies qualitative methods to explore the institutional adaptation process, social dynamics, and sustainability of the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM) after the program. The study was conducted in Tanah Kalikedinding Village, Kenjeran District, Surabaya City, with BKM as the object of analysis. Research informants included BKM administrators, community leaders, and beneficiaries, selected based on their participation and understanding of BKM activities and institutional progress. This approach allows the study to capture the experiences, perspectives, and social processes that shape the institution's sustainability contextually.

Data were collected through in-depth interviews, direct observation, and document analysis. Interviews focused on exploring the experiences, perspectives, and strategies of the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM) in maintaining and developing its role

after the end of PNPM/KOTAKU. Observations were conducted on institutional activities and BKM's relationships with the community, while documents were used to supplement field data and verify interview results. The research process employed Participatory Action Research Strategies (PARS), which involve the community as active actors in identifying problems, formulating alternative solutions, and assessing the process. This strategy aligns with the social innovation perspective, which emphasizes community engagement and the participation of local actors in creating solutions to collective problems [27].

Data were analyzed thematically by grouping the results of interviews, observations, and documents into themes of innovation patterns, institutional strategies, BKM's socio-economic contributions, and factors supporting and inhibiting the sustainability of innovation. The analysis was conducted in stages by identifying key information, grouping themes, interpreting relationships between themes, and drawing conclusions based on empirical results. In the initial stages of the research, the analysis focused on mapping BKM institutions and determining the types of social innovations that emerged, including the formation of cooperatives as economic entities. These steps provide the foundation for understanding the process of BKM's transformation from a program-based organization to a more flexible and independent community, as well as the importance of the institutionalization of innovation to maintain the sustainability of innovative practices.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Institutional Sustainability of BKM Post-Program

Research findings indicate that the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM) in Tanah Kalikedinding Village continues to perform its social functions even after the completion of the PNPM Mandiri Urban/KOTAKU program. This presence demonstrates that institutions established through government program interventions do not completely disappear when the program ends. BKM still has the opportunity to perform social functions and expand activities related to community needs. This finding indicates a form of institutional sustainability at the community level that needs to be understood as a process of adjustment, not simply an administrative existence. Sustainability is crucial because it demonstrates the institutional capacity to maintain its existence in the face of existing policy changes.

The sustainability of the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM) demonstrates that community institutions can continue to perform certain functions after the program support that underpinned their formation has ended. The end of the PNPM Mandiri Urban/KOTAKU program did not necessarily eliminate all BKM activities, but rather changed the institution's latitude in determining which activities could be maintained. Functions directly related to community needs were easier to maintain because they were linked to the social life of the community at the village level. The choice to maintain social functions also demonstrates that the BKM's existence does not solely depend on its status as a government program implementer. The ability to maintain social functions

demonstrate that the BKM began to adapt its institutional role to community needs after the program ended.

The BKM is no longer in the same position as when it was involved in implementing government programs, so its sustainability requires the ability to adapt the institution's functions and orientation. From an institutional innovation perspective, this process demonstrates that change does not always come from establishing new institutions, but can occur through modifying the functions of existing institutions. Hjelmars [19] explains that sustainable public innovation is related to the process of institutionalization, namely when innovative practices begin to gain a position in organizational structures and practices.

Adaptation is crucial for the sustainability of the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM) because changing community needs require the organization to adjust its activities. A BKM that maintains its management structure without expanding its activities will become increasingly disconnected from the issues residents face in their daily lives. Changing work methods, expanding functions, and collaborating with other actors can provide space for the BKM to maintain its role at the village level. The BKM's experience in implementing social activities can serve as a basis for developing new activities that align with community resources and needs. Studies on experimental governance also show that urban innovation can develop gradually through management flexibility and the involvement of various actors [15], [16].

The research results also show that the sustainability of BKM is inseparable from the existence of the community as the institutional foundation. BKM remains relevant if its existence can meet community needs and provide a venue for social and economic activities. Thus, the sustainability of an institution is assessed not only by its organizational structure but also by its ability to maintain its functions and social relationships with the community. This aligns with the findings of Eckhardt et al. [20] which emphasizes participation as a crucial element in inclusive urban development, because the sustainability of institutions requires space for community involvement in the development process.

The relationship between the BKM and the community also demonstrates that institutional sustainability is inseparable from the institution's ability to build trust and maintain social legitimacy. After a government program ends, the BKM's legitimacy no longer stems primarily from its position within the program structure, but increasingly relies on community recognition and acceptance. Continued social activities serve as a mechanism for maintaining this relationship. In the context of local governance, community involvement and relationships between actors are crucial because they can strengthen collective capacity in managing shared issues [28], [29], [30], [31].

These findings also demonstrate a shift in institutional resources. As government program support declines, BKMs need to rely on locally available resources, including social networks, community knowledge, management skills, and relationships with other actors. This shift means that BKMs' sustainability depends not only on their ability to secure funding but also on their ability to organize available resources. Managing local

resources can provide a foundation for developing new activities when community institutions no longer receive the same form of program support as before.

When compared with previous research, these results broaden the discourse on BKM, which has often been associated with the dynamics and independence of institutions in the context of the KOTAKU program.[9]emphasizes the importance of understanding the dynamics and independence of BKM groups during program implementation. This research shifts the focus to the post-program situation, where BKM must maintain its relevance without relying entirely on the program framework that previously served as the foundation for institutional activities. This changing context makes BKM sustainability an interesting institutional transformation process to study.

The differences in the condition of the BKM before and after the program ended demonstrate that the institution's independence is not solely measured by its ability to carry out activities without government support. Independence is evident in the management's ability to understand changing community needs, determine activities deemed essential, manage available resources, and build working relationships with other parties at the village level. These changes place the BKM in a more open position to determine the direction of its activities based on community issues, rather than solely following the government's program agenda. In this situation, the organization's sustainability depends on the BKM's ability to maintain its still-needed functions while developing activities that can expand community benefits. This process provides the basis for institutional innovation, as experience managing social activities can be used to develop economic functions that are more appropriate to the conditions of the Tanah Kalikedinding community.

In the context of Tanah Kalikedinding, this development is crucial because the BKM's social activities can provide initial capital for building more organized economic activities. Experience in managing community activities provides knowledge about community needs, participation patterns, and potential resources. This institutional capital can be used to develop new forms of activity without losing the BKM's identity as a community-based institution. Thus, institutional innovation can occur through a gradual development process from existing functions to more productive and sustainable ones.

Thus, the sustainability of the Tanah Kalikedinding BKM can be interpreted as the initial stage of change in community institutions. BKM is no longer merely an administrative remnant of a government program, but is beginning to demonstrate its ability to maintain its social function and create opportunities for community economic activities. This finding also serves as a foundation for observing more concrete institutional innovations, particularly through the formation of cooperatives as BKM business entities. In other words, organizational sustainability is a key prerequisite for the emergence of innovations that keep BKM relevant in community life after the program.

Cooperatives as an Initial Form of Institutional Innovation

The main findings of the study revealed that the formation of cooperatives was one of the initial forms of institutional innovation by the BKM (BKM) in Tanah Kalikedinding. Cooperatives were intended as business entities capable of supporting the community's productive economic activities while also serving as a tool to strengthen the institution's financial foundation. This finding is significant because it demonstrates efforts to optimize internal resources after the government program ended. Developing locally resource-based institutions can be part of the social innovation process when organizations are able to transform existing capacities into new practices that have economic and social benefits [32]. Therefore, innovation does not emerge as a completely different structural transformation, but rather through the improvement of the economic functions of existing institutions.

The establishment of cooperatives also reflects a shift in institutional orientation. During the period when BKM was within the context of a government empowerment program, institutional activities were closely linked to the program's agenda and resources. Post-program, the demands of maintaining organizational continuity triggered the need for internal resources. The ability of local organizations to maintain innovative practices is related to the institutionalization process and the capacity of actors to manage resources sustainably [33]. The development of economic units can be understood as a form of adaptation to these changes, as BKM seeks to link organizational continuity with community economic activities. In the context of social innovation, the link between community needs and institutional formation is a crucial element in creating solutions that have social value and practical benefits [27].

The innovative value of cooperatives is determined not only by their organizational structure but also by the role they aim to achieve through these institutions. Cooperatives aim to link community-based businesses (BKM) with the community's productive economic activities, ensuring that community institutions not only function socially but also have the tools to increase economic independence. This pattern aligns with the view that social innovation can emerge when local actors combine existing resources with community needs to create solutions tailored to the local context [34], [35]. The process of organizing resources by local actors is also an important part of building community-based innovation because it allows communities to develop collective capacity to address the problems they face.

From an institutional innovation perspective, the establishment of cooperatives can serve as a first step in transforming innovation from mere concepts to institutionalized practices. A study by Pradana et al. [24] reveals that the process of institutionalizing innovation requires the organization's ability to sustain innovative practices so that they do not just remain as temporary activities. Van Hulst's study [36] also positions local innovation as a process that develops through practice, learning, and strengthening the capacity of actors so that change can occur gradually within existing institutions. Within the framework of the Tanah Kalikedinding BKM, cooperatives can be seen as a tool that makes economic activities an aspect of the organization's

sustainability strategy. However, because this research is still in its early stages, the success of cooperatives in achieving financial independence cannot be definitively determined and still requires further in-depth study.

The findings indicate that cooperatives play a crucial role in the BKM transformation process. Their existence demonstrates a shift from a program-based focus to one that enhances the institution's internal capacity. Simultaneously, cooperatives unite two interests: the continuity of the BKM organization and the productive economic needs of the community. The relationship between social goals and economic activity is a crucial characteristic in the development of community-based organizations, particularly as organizations strive to maintain social benefits while simultaneously building resources that can support institutional sustainability [37]. As a result, the formation of cooperatives can be interpreted as an initial form of social innovation in institutions that have potential, but their sustainability still depends on the BKM's ability to manage economic units, maintain community participation, and establish cooperation with local parties.

The existence of cooperatives also provides space for BKM to develop more adaptive forms of management after the end of government program support. Changes in organizational functions can occur through adjustments to local needs without having to abandon established institutional structures. This process allows organizations to leverage existing experience, networks, and resources to develop new activities. A study by Eneqvist et al.[15]demonstrates that institutional experiments in urban contexts can serve as a learning tool for local actors in developing governance forms that better meet community needs. In the case of Tanah Kalikedinding, the cooperative became a platform for testing the BKM's ability to develop economic functions while maintaining a community empowerment orientation.

Cooperative development is also inseparable from the capacity of BKM to build relationships with various local actors. Economic activities require access to markets, capital, knowledge, business networks, and institutional support, all of which are not readily available within the organization. Therefore, the success of innovation depends on the BKM's ability to connect internal resources with those from the surrounding institutional environment. Studies on social innovation show that inter-institutional relationships and the ability to build networks are crucial in expanding the capacity of community organizations [38]. Cooperatives can thus serve as a meeting point between the internal capacity of BKM and the economic opportunities available at the local level.

The dimension of community participation is another factor determining whether cooperatives can develop as social innovations. Community involvement is necessary not only during the formation stage but also in decision-making, activity management, and utilization of business results. Participation provides space for communities to maintain their position as both actors and beneficiaries of institutional activities. Afandi et al.'s findings [39] emphasized that community organizing capacity can strengthen social innovation when local actors have the space to play a role in collective problem-solving. For the Tanah Kalikedinding Community Cooperative (BKM Tanah Kalikedinding),

participation is a crucial foundation to prevent cooperatives from becoming business units operating separately from the goal of community empowerment.

The sustainability of cooperatives also requires the BKM's ability to maintain a balance between economic interests and social goals. A sole profit-oriented orientation can alienate cooperatives from their primary function as instruments of empowerment, while a social orientation without adequate business management can limit the organization's ability to survive. Social innovation requires a balance between social value creation, organizational capacity, and the ability to manage resources sustainably. Therefore, cooperative development needs to be positioned as part of the BKM's institutional strategy, not merely as an additional economic activity.

Overall, the formation of the cooperative demonstrates a process of changing the function of the BKM from an institution heavily dependent on government programs to one that is beginning to build internal capacity. This change occurs through the utilization of existing institutional structures, the development of economic activities, and the strengthening of relationships with the community and local actors. This pattern demonstrates the gradual nature of innovation, as change is not driven by the creation of entirely new institutions, but rather by the development of the functions of institutions with existing experience and social networks. The findings of Sancino et al.[33] demonstrates that sustainable community-based development requires institutional capacity, local organization, and support for community resource management. Thus, the BKM Tanah Kalikedinding cooperative can be positioned as an initial stage of institutional innovation leading to organizational independence, although its effectiveness and sustainability still need to be demonstrated through the development of cooperative performance, member participation, and the ability to build local economic networks.

Challenges of Strengthening Social Innovation

Despite demonstrating institutional sustainability and beginning to develop innovation through cooperatives, the Tanah Kalikedinding Community-Based Community Empowerment Agency (BKM Tanah Kalikedinding) still faces various challenges. One such issue is the suboptimal synergy between the BKM and the village government. This situation indicates that community-based institutional innovation is influenced not only by the BKM's internal capacity but also by the institutional context in which it operates. Inter-institutional relationships are crucial because support, communication, and access to information can influence the competitiveness of community organizations in maintaining and developing their innovations. Analysis by Temmerman et al.[40] show that social innovation in urban governance develops through collaboration between government, communities, and other actors involved in a shared problem-solving process. This limited synergy significantly impacts access to several institutional documents and the information processing process related to post-PNPM/KOTAKU policies and programs.

The limited relationship between the BKM and the sub-district government can also be seen in the BKM's continued need for institutional support to develop its

organizational capacity. Local governments not only play a role as policymakers but can also provide access to the information, networks, resources, and coordination space needed by community organizations.[41]demonstrates that participatory local governance can create an enabling environment for innovative ideas and practices to flourish at the community level. Such relationships are crucial for BKM because innovation capacity is formed not only through internal resources but also through an institutional environment that provides space for participation and resource exchange [42].

These obstacles make the process of collecting formal institutional information more time-consuming. In qualitative studies, such access issues also affect researchers' ability to verify information from informants with institutional documents. Therefore, documentation issues are not only a technical research challenge but also highlight the importance of transparency and collaboration among stakeholders in supporting the sustainability of community institutions. From an urban governance perspective, this situation demonstrates that social innovation occurs within a multi-stakeholder ecosystem.

Access to information and transparency between actors are also related to an organization's ability to build institutional learning processes. Available information enables community actors to understand policy changes, identify opportunities for collaboration, and adapt activities to the needs of their institutional environment. Several studies on social innovation and public services demonstrate that a multi-actor approach requires interactions that enable knowledge exchange, coordination of interests, and the establishment of working relationships between government and community organizations [40], [43]. In the context of the BKM Tanah Kalikedinding, access to institutional information is part of the capacity needed to maintain the continuity of innovation after the government program ends.

In the view of McGuirk et al.[18] emphasizes that innovation in urban governance must be seen as a process involving relationships and interactions between various actors, rather than solely as the actions of a single institution. In the context of the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM), the sub-district government is a key actor that can help create an institutional environment that encourages innovation. When coordination is lacking, the scope for innovation development becomes narrower because the BKM does not operate within a fully independent social and institutional space.

This challenge also indicates that achieving sustainability in innovation requires an adaptable collaborative process. McGuirk et al.[18]emphasizes that innovation in city management typically develops through gradual or incremental stages, rather than through radical, all-at-once change. This perspective is highly relevant to the situation at the Tanah Kalikedinding BKM, as institutional strengthening should not be viewed as a complete transformation, but rather as a gradual process involving strengthening ties with the government, community, and other relevant parties. Therefore, the currently observed limitations in collaboration should be viewed as an opportunity for evaluation to strengthen innovation in the next phase.

The gradual process of strengthening innovation also requires space for experimentation, learning, and institutional adjustment. Urban innovation does not always result in immediate changes to governance structures, but can evolve through practices tested in local contexts before acquiring more stable institutional forms. Roebke et al.[44] shows that urban experiments are influenced by actor capacity, place-based leadership, institutional entrepreneurship, and innovative capabilities in driving institutional change. Røste [45] also demonstrates that experimental governance can gradually transform institutional routines through a learning process and the formation of shared interests. This pattern is relevant for the Tanah Kalikedinding BKM because strengthening relations with the village government can be developed through a gradual collaborative process, rather than through all-out institutional change.

Strengthening the relationship between the BKM and the village government also needs to be directed towards establishing clearer working mechanisms. Coordination is not sufficient through informal communication alone; it requires a division of roles, channels for information exchange, and meeting spaces that allow each party to understand the needs and capacities of other actors. Studies on collaborative governance in social innovation show that the success of collaboration is greatly influenced by the ability of actors to build working relationships and connect different interests in a shared process[42], [43]. For the Tanah Kalikedinding BKM, such a mechanism can expand access to policy information while simultaneously opening up opportunities for cooperatives and community economic activities to gain support from the local institutional environment.

Based on this, the main challenge in strengthening BKM's social innovation lies not only in the ability to create new activities, but also in the ability to build an institutional ecosystem that supports the sustainability of innovation. BKM requires a more transparent relationship with the village government, adequate access to information, and a coordination mechanism that can transform community needs into institutional activities. Therefore, strengthening innovation must shift from an organizational-focused approach to a collaborative approach that links BKM's internal capacity with support from the local institutional environment.

Direction of Institutional Social Innovation Model

Based on preliminary findings, the social innovation model within the Tanah Kalikedinding BKM institution focuses on four main components: the sustainability of community institutions, community involvement, strengthening productive economic activities, and collaboration with local stakeholders. These four components are interrelated and inseparable, serving to strengthen the BKM's capacity after the program concludes. Institutional continuity serves as the foundation, community involvement serves as a social foundation, productive economic activities serve as a tool to strengthen independence, and collaboration serves as a supportive element originating from the institution's environment. These findings remain conceptual and serve as a foundation for further in-depth research in the future.

The first component is the sustainability of community institutions. The finding that BKM continued to operate after the PNPM/KOTAKU program ended indicates that organizational continuity is the first step in developing innovation. Without a relatively sustainable institution, community organizing and developing new activities will be difficult to implement consistently. From an institutional innovation perspective, this continuity is crucial so that the initiatives developed are not merely temporary but have the potential to become part of more enduring institutional practices [24].

The four components mentioned above do not operate in a linear fashion, but rather form a mutually reinforcing relationship in the BKM institutional development process. Organizational continuity provides space for community involvement, while community participation provides social support for the development of economic activities through cooperatives. Growing economic activity can strengthen BKM resources, while relationships with village governments and local actors provide access to information, networks, and resources needed to develop the institution's activities. The interrelationship between these components forms an important foundation for understanding the BKM social innovation model as a gradual and contextual process.

The second component encompasses community engagement. BKM is essentially an institution directly connected to the community, so innovation development requires maintaining citizen participation as a basis for legitimacy and social sustainability. Engagement allows for community needs to be integrated into the decision-making process of the institution's activities while fostering a sense of ownership of the innovations implemented. An inclusive urban development perspective demonstrates that opportunities for community participation are crucial for creating governance that is more responsive to community needs [20].

Community involvement also plays a crucial role in linking the BKM's social function with the economic activities developed through cooperatives. Community participation can help determine the form of activities that best meet local needs while ensuring that economic activities remain empowering. This relationship positions cooperatives not only as instruments for obtaining financial resources but also as a space for maintaining social ties between BKM and the community. In this way, the sustainability of the innovation model depends on BKM's ability to maintain a balance between organizational interests and the benefits felt by the community.

The third element is strengthening productive economic activities through cooperatives. The results of the cooperative formation indicate that BKM is beginning to develop economic tools as an element of its institutional sustainability strategy. Productive economic activities serve two simultaneous functions: creating opportunities to strengthen the community economy and providing opportunities for BKM to develop existing resources. From a social innovation perspective, this integration of social and economic functions can serve as an institutional adaptation as community organizations strive to create solutions tailored to local needs[27]. The fourth element is cooperation with local parties.

The results of research related to the less-than-optimal synergy between the BKM and the village government indicate that collaboration is a crucial element that must be strengthened. The BKM social innovation model is not intended as an independent institutional model, but rather as a community institution that can establish relationships with the government and other local parties. Based on the total findings, these four elements can be understood as the main foundation of the BKM institutional social innovation model: institutional sustainability, community participation, strengthening the productive economy, and stakeholder collaboration, with the entire process aimed at increasing community capacity and independence. This model is still in its early conceptual stages and needs further testing and research before being established as a final, repeatable model.

CONCLUSION

Fundamental Finding : The first phase of the study showed that the Community Empowerment Agency (BKM) in Tanah Kalikedinding Village continues to carry out its social role even though the PNPM Mandiri Urban/KOTAKU program has ended. The initial form of innovation found was the formation of a cooperative as a business unit of the BKM. The cooperative is intended to support productive economic activities for the community while providing opportunities to strengthen the financial independence of the institution. **Implication :** These findings indicate a shift in BKM's focus from reliance on external programs to efforts to develop internal resources through activities directly related to the community's economic needs. In this way, BKM institutional innovation has begun to grow through the integration of social and economic functions. This situation indicates that the sustainability of innovation does not only depend on the internal capabilities of BKM, but also requires support from the institutional environment, communication, and cooperation between stakeholders. **Limitation :** However, the strengthening of social innovation has not been optimal. The research shows that collaboration between BKM and the village government still needs to be improved, while limited access to some institutional documents also hinders the development and dissemination of information regarding BKM's existence after the program. The model cannot be considered a final model because the research is still in its early stages. **Future Research :** Therefore, further studies are needed to strengthen empirical evidence, test the sustainability of cooperatives and BKM activities, and design an institutional model that is more adaptive, participatory, and applicable to other urban coastal community contexts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Joko Adianto, Mohammad Fazrin Rahman, Rossa Turpuk Gabe, and Adinda Christina, "The Complexity of Contextuality: A Case Study on Vertical Housing Facilities in Surabaya, Indonesia," *Environ. Urban. ASIA*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 99–112, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1177/09754253221076351.
- [2] M. M. Kartikasari, "Public participation of environmental cadre groups in Surabaya city in waste management," *Cogent Soc. Sci.*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 2438139, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2024.2438139.
- [3] D. Septanti, I. Ahmed, W. Setyawan, S. Cahyadi, and T. S. Narida, "Community-Based Risk Analysis: Assessing Multi-Hazard Vulnerabilities in Urban Kampung in Surabaya, Indonesia," 2026. doi: 10.3390/architecture6010026.
- [4] M. M. Alissa Diesch, "Hidden gems: The potential of places and social innovation for circular territories in Bogotá," *J. Civ. Eng. Planning, Des.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–5, 2024.
- [5] A. Prasetya, "Practical Study of Tidal Flooding as an Impact of Sea Level Rise in the City of Surabaya in Terms of Social and Ecological Implications," *KnE Soc. Sci.*, vol. 10, no. 26, pp. 193–199, 2025, doi: 10.18502/kss.v10i26.19997.
- [6] P. F. Nuryananda, P. D. Yakti, and W. A. Utami, "Sociocultural Perspective of Fishermen Community in Kedung Cowek on Covid-19 Pandemic In Surabaya," *J. Kebijak. Sos. Ekon. Kelaut. dan Perikan.*, no. 2, pp. 127–136, 2022, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15578/jksekp.v12i2.11038>.
- [7] D. A. Safitri *et al.*, "The Socioeconomic Effect of Changes in Coastal Areas : A Case Study of Coastal Areas in Surabaya," *EXTRAPOLASI*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 106–120, 2022.
- [8] W. E. Yulistika and E. Priyanti, "POLICY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE KOTAKU PROGRAM TO OVERCOME SLUM CATEGORIES IN BEKASI DISTRICT," *DIMENSI*, vol. 12, no. November, pp. 687–699, 2023.
- [9] M. B. Ahmadi and F. Madarisa, "Dinamika Dan Kemandirian Kelompok Badan Keswadayaan Masyarakat (BKM) Program Kota Tanpa Kumuh (KOTAKU)," *Niara*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 476–484, 2023.
- [10] N. Qodriyah and S. P. Estiasih, "ANALISIS KINERJA KEUANGAN UNIT PENGELOLA KEUANGAN PADA BADAN KESWADAYAAN MASYARAKAT ATAU LEMBAGA KESWADAYAAN MASYARAKAT DI KOTA MADIUN," *J. Akunt. dan Pajak*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2022.
- [11] S. Iskandar *et al.*, "PELAKSANAAN PENANGGULANGAN KEMISKINAN DI DESA," *J. Kapita Sel. Adm. Publik*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 149–155, 2022.
- [12] A. D. Idelia, Y. Yusuf, and I. A. Kurniawan, "IMPLEMENTASI PROGRAM KOTA TANPA KUMUH (KOTAKU) DI KELURAHAN CIBODAS KECAMATAN CIBODAS KOTA TANGERANG Aramita Dinah Idelia, Yusmedi Yusuf, Irvan Arif Kurniawan," *J. Ilm. Ilmu Adm.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 87–94, 2021.
- [13] J. Kroh, "Sustain(able) urban (eco)systems: Stakeholder-related success factors in urban innovation projects," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, vol. 168, p. 120767, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120767>.
- [14] M. Liu and K. Lo, "Governing eco-cities in China: Urban climate experimentation, international cooperation, and multilevel governance," *Geoforum*, vol. 121, pp. 12–22, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.02.017>.
- [15] E. Eneqvist, J. Algehed, C. Jensen, and A. Karvonen, "Legitimacy in municipal experimental governance: questioning the public good in urban innovation practices," *Eur. Plan. Stud.*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1596–1614, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1080/09654313.2021.2015749.
- [16] F. Ehnert, "Review of research into urban experimentation in the fields of sustainability transitions and environmental governance," *Eur. Plan. Stud.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 76–102, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1080/09654313.2022.2070424.
- [17] L. Mora, P. Gerli, L. Ardito, and A. Messeni Petruzzelli, "Smart city governance from an innovation management perspective: Theoretical framing, review of current practices, and

- future research agenda," *Technovation*, vol. 123, p. 102717, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.technovation.2023.102717.
- [18] A. S. Pauline McGuirk, Tom Baker, Robyn Dowling, Sophia Maalsen, "Enacting urban governance innovation: beyond strategic pathways to incremental 'muddling through,'" *Urban Geogr*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 1539–1563, 2025.
- [19] U. Hjelm, "The institutionalization of public innovation : Evidence from Indonesia," *Public Manag Rev*, no. 1, pp. 53–69., 2021, doi: 10.1177/00953997231151438.
- [20] J. Eckhardt, C. Kaletka, and B. Pelka, "Monitoring inclusive urban development alongside a human rights approach on participation opportunities," *Eur Plan Stud*, vol. 28, pp. 991–1009., 2020.
- [21] T. K. Y. Hempri Suyatna, "Institutionalised Social Entrepreneurship (ISE) in the Context of Indonesia Decentralizing Social Welfare Provision," *J Soc Entrep*, pp. 1–20., 2024.
- [22] A. Salam, I. T. Sihidi, N. F. Akmalia, and H. K. Hardini, "Social Innovation of Tourism Village: Asset-based Community Development in East Rombiya Village , Madura , Indonesia," (*Jurnal Sosiol. Walisongo*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 95–112, 2025, doi: 10.21580/jsw.2025.9.1.26980.
- [23] Y. C. CHEE HON CHAN, CHERYL HIU-KWAN CHUI, "The role of social innovation policy in social service sector reform: Evidence from Hong Kong," *J Soc Policy*, pp. 1–19, 2021, doi: 10.1017/S0047279421000167.
- [24] and E. S. I Putu Yoga Bumi Pradana, Wahyudi Kumorotomo, "The Institutionalization of Public Innovation: Evidence from Indonesia," *Evid. from Indones.*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 726–751, 2023.
- [25] A. Salam, I. T. Sihidi, and U. Basriyah, "The Role of Social Capital in the Successful Implementation of Resilient Villages: A Case Study of Jetak Lor Hamlet, Malang Regency Abdus Salam 1* , Iradhad Taqwa Sihidi 2 , Unika Basriyah 3," *J. Sos. Polit.*, vol. 8090, no. 246, pp. 1–14, 2025, doi: 10.22219/jurnalsopol.v11i1.40230.
- [26] P. M. Guirk, T. Baker, A. Sisson, R. Dowling, and S. Maalsen, "Innovating urban governance : A research agenda," *Prog Hum Geogr*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 1391–1412., 2022.
- [27] K. Maldonado-Mariscal, "Grassroots innovation and social innovation in perspective," *Front Sociol*, no. October, pp. 1–11, 2023, doi: 10.3389/fsoc.2023.1247293.
- [28] M. Rabbani, S. Rahman, and D. Tasneem, "Trust and citizen participation in community-based monitoring system: An experimental evidence from Bangladesh," *J. Behav. Exp. Econ.*, vol. 98, p. 101884, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soc.2022.101884>.
- [29] S. A. Kasimba and P. Lujala, "Community based participatory governance platforms and sharing of mining benefits: evidence from Ghana," *Community Dev. J.*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 635–654, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.1093/cdj/bsab021.
- [30] B. Denter, "Do participants consider community initiatives as successful, and if so why?," *Cities*, vol. 137, p. 104288, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2023.104288>.
- [31] G. Hu, J. Wang, U. Laila, S. Fahad, and J. Li, "Evaluating households' community participation: Does community trust play any role in sustainable development?," *Front. Environ. Sci.*, vol. Volume 10-2022, 2022, doi: 10.3389/fenvs.2022.951262.
- [32] S. Bucio-Mendoza and J. A. Solis-Navarrete, "Institutionalising social innovation in the Global South: Lessons learned," *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 20, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39556.
- [33] A. Sancino, F. Scognamiglio, L. Corvo, F. Imperiale, and G. Pasi, "Institutionalizing Experimental Places for Inclusive Social Innovation: From Utopias to Heterotopias," *Volunt. Int. J. Volunt. Nonprofit Organ.*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 240–252, 2024, doi: DOI: 10.1007/s11266-023-00584-w.
- [34] N. Vercher, G. Bosworth, and J. Esparcia, "Developing a framework for radical and incremental social innovation in rural areas," *J. Rural Stud.*, vol. 99, pp. 233–242, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.01.007>.

- [35] K. Nordberg, S. Virkkala, and Å. Mariussen, "Municipalities and communities enabling social innovations in peripheral areas – case studies from Ostrobothnia, Finland," *Geogr. Ann. Ser. B, Hum. Geogr.*, vol. 106, no. 1, pp. 74–95, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1080/04353684.2023.2225537.
- [36] M. Van Hulst, C. Durose, and A. Agger, "HOW LOCAL PRACTICES OF SOCIOPOLITICAL INNOVATION DEVELOP: And Why This Matters for Urban Transformations," *Int. J. Urban Reg. Res.*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 585–602, Jul. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13246>.
- [37] S. M. Piabuo, V. Ingram, H. Runhaar, M. Hoogstra-Klein, D. Foundjem-Tita, and P. A. Minang, "Community capacity for social enterprise development: Empirical evidence from community forest enterprises (CFEs) in Cameroon," *Environ. Dev.*, vol. 47, p. 100884, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2023.100884>.
- [38] D. Wegner, R. Hölsgens, and C. C. Bitencourt, "Orchestrating collaborative networks for social innovation: Orchestrators' roles in socially innovative initiatives," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, vol. 195, p. 122786, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122786>.
- [39] M. N. Afandi, E. Tri Anomsari, B. Setiyono, A. Novira, and W. Sutyono, "Self-organizing volunteers as a grassroot social innovation: the contribution and barrier to empowerment and collaborative governance in stunting intervention," *Dev. Stud. Res.*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 2357102, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1080/21665095.2024.2357102.
- [40] L. Temmerman, C. Veeckman, and P. Ballon, "Collaborative governance platform for social innovation in Brussels," *Soc. Enterp. J.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 165–182, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1108/SEJ-12-2019-0101.
- [41] Sangmin Kim, "A participatory local governance approach to social innovation: A case study of Seongbuk-gu, South Korea," *Environ. Plan. C Polit. Sp.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 201–220, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1177/23996544211005784.
- [42] T. Lenz and M. L. Shier, "Supporting Transformational Social Innovation through Nonprofit and Local Government Relations: A Scoping Literature Review," *Hum. Serv. Organ. Manag. Leadersh. Gov.*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 454–478, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.1080/23303131.2021.1887033.
- [43] C. Merlin-Brogniart *et al.*, "Social innovation and public service: A literature review of multi-actor collaborative approaches in five European countries," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, vol. 182, p. 121826, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121826>.
- [44] L. Roebke, M. Grillitsch, and L. Coenen, "Assessing change agency in urban experiments for sustainability transitions," *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transitions*, vol. 45, pp. 214–227, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2022.10.007>.
- [45] R. Røste, "Co-evolutionary dynamics of experimental governance: a longitudinal study of sustainable mobility services in Oslo," *J. Environ. Policy Plan.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 42–54, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1080/1523908X.2022.2076661.

***Abdus Salam (Corresponding Author)**

Muhammadiyah University of Malang, Indonesia

Brawijaya University, Indonesia

Email: abdussalam@umm.ac.id**Iradhad Taqwa Sihidi**

Muhammadiyah University of Malang, Indonesia

Email: iradhad@umm.ac.id**Lintang Masitha**

Muhammadiyah University of Malang, Indonesia

Email: lintang@umm.ac.id**Yudhistira Ananta**

Muhammadiyah University of Malang, Indonesia

Email: ananta@umm.ac.id
