

## Entrepreneurship Ethical Embeddedness of Weaver Women in the Social Structures of Bugis Ethnic Group in South Sulawesi

### *Keterlekatan Etika Kewirausahaan Perempuan Penenun pada Struktur Sosial Etnik Bugis di Sulawesi Selatan*

Muhammad Syukur<sup>1,\*</sup>, Akhmad<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Departement Sociology of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, 90222, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Economy and Business, University of Muhammadiyah Makasaar, Makassar, 90222 Indonesia

\*Correspondence e-mail: [m.syukur@unm.ac.id](mailto:m.syukur@unm.ac.id)

Received: November 1, 2022 | Revised: April 13, 2023 | Accepted: May 4, 2023 | Online Publication: May 19, 2023

#### ABSTRACT

Loom development and the entry of the market economy system into the socio-economic system of weavers create three weaver groups with different entrepreneurial ethics. This research aims to describe the differences in entrepreneurial ethics of weaver women in South Sulawesi so that they could survive from market economy system penetration. The research uses a qualitative approach. The data collection method is conducted through in-depth interviews, observation, and focus group discussion. Data analysis consists of three steps, namely, data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. The research results indicate that there are differences in entrepreneurial ethics between the three weaver groups. Gedogan (primitive loom) weavers have oversocialized entrepreneurial ethics, improved handloom (*Alat Tenun Bukan Mesin*) weavers have an entrepreneurial ethics between oversocialized and undersocialized, whilst weaving business women have an entrepreneurial ethics that is more towards undersocialized action. The strong embeddedness of entrepreneurial ethics in the oversocialized pole induces gedogan weavers as the strongest group in addressing price fluctuations and external interventions in textile production. A balanced embeddedness of entrepreneurial ethic between oversocialized and under socialized actions among the ATBM weavers makes them the most prone to failure in business due to limited capital, production, and network that makes them unable to compete with local weaving entrepreneurs at national and global levels. The embeddedness of weaving entrepreneurs' actions in the under socialized pole makes does not make to play a further role in economic activities, but their economic success is compensated by religiousness and social piety.

**Keywords:** *business women, embeddedness, entrepreneurial ethics, weavers*



Content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International. Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.

Published under Department of Communication and Community Development Science, IPB University and in association with Ikatan Sosiologi Indonesia

E-ISSN: 2302-7525 | P-ISSN: 2302-7157

## INTRODUCTION

Study on economic action was initially introduced by Weber (1978) as a fundamental cement of human economic behavior. Economic action is a specific and unique behavior of all other human behaviors due to deep involvement of human rationality and instinct in the decision-making process. Hirschman opines that the economic action idea is identical to rational behavior (Granovetter, 1992a). A neo-classic economic principle states that humans are motivated to conduct economic actions because they want to look for maximum utility. This is an effort to fulfill life necessities to achieve economic improvement at the same time. Economic actors constantly use their own resources, organization, tools, and techniques in their actions. Studies on the embeddedness of women's economic activities have been conducted by various experts, such as (Seelos, Mair, Battilana, & Tina Dacin, 2011; Agrawal, 2018).

Various studies indicate that woman participation in economic activities play a decisive role in world economic growth and development (Minniti, 2005; Roomi, 2009). Woman entrepreneurs provide a significant contribution in job opportunity creation and wealth generation in economic sector (Acs, Song, Szerb, Audretsch, & Komlosi, 2021; Brush & Cooper, 2012). Most studies on women's entrepreneurship analytically uncover how institutions affect the psychological aspects of women's entrepreneurship. A study by Jamilah, et.al., (2016) indicated differences in the embeddedness of economic action in three typologies of embroidery entrepreneurs in Tasikmalaya. Arsita, Zuber, & Demartoto, (2020) found a social embeddedness of MSME in sarong production in Kalijambe, Sragen where weaving activities are conducted since it is a cultural heritage from generation to generation. The research did not elaborate on the existence of weaving typologies in Sragen.

Women are equally noted for perseverance, innovativeness in problem solving, and ability to empathize with customers than their male counterparts (Udofot & John, 2017; Orser & Elliott, 2015). It is argued that women have high propensity to take calculated risk with huge success and to think through business proposal positively (Langowitz & Minniti, 2007). Ethical decision-making is also imperative and women entrepreneurs' decision-making styles improve business performance (Eslam et al., 2020; Carter, Simkins, & Simpson, 2003). Factors related to environment and motivation are responsible for women entrepreneurs' performance (Mahajar & Yunus, 2012; Isaga, 2019; Grine, Fares, & Meguellati, 2015).

None of the researchers in previous studies, either those related to a theme of women's roles in economic development or women's ethics in business activities, examine local wisdom that forms the economic activities of the community studied. Several studies that are previously reviewed do not engage with moral ethics and local institutions that form community's economic action. Therefore, the research is crucial to compare the embeddedness of entrepreneurial ethics of weaver women in Wajo Regency.

The integration of weaving activities on market economy system in South Sulawesi changes weaver communities' socioeconomic system. The phenomenon appeared with the occurrence of wage labors, the use of advanced weaving technology, the existence of production management, the utilization of capital/money from formal financial institutions, and the occurrence of differentiation of roles and status such as weaving entrepreneurs, collectors, and intermediaries. The phenomenon had been developed when changes occurred in improving handlooms (*Alat Tenun Bukan Mesin/ATBM*), and machine looms (*Alat Tenun Mesin/ATM*) started to be used in 1950 and 2004, respectively (Syukur, 2014). Since ATBM (manual looms) and ATM (machine looms) were utilized in weaving activities, weaving production orientation can no longer meet customary clothing needs (sarongs and cloths) for Bugis Makassar people, but it is based on the market taste outside South Sulawesi region.

Statistic data of Wajo Regency indicate that there are about 4,982 *gedogan* weavers in the area with production of 99,640 sarongs per year and 227 ATBM weavers with production of 1,589,000 meter of fabric per year. There are 4 (four) weavers who use machine looms (ATM) with 85 machines and production capacity of 1,750,000 meter of fabric per year. Ninety-one people are specializing in yarn spinner, whereas 301 families work in mulberry planting and silkworm rearing with production of 4,250 kilogram of yarn per year (Statistic of Wajo Regency, 2021).

The economic rational action theory could not explain much if it ignores location and environmental context that determine economic actors and communities where they are located. Therefore, Granovetter dan Swedberg (Granovetter, 1985; Granovetter, 1992) state that economic action is socially located and unexplainable by referring only to individual motives itself. As a form of social action, economic action is embedded to a personal relationship network instead of those conducted by the actors. According to

the perspective, it can be seen that an economic action is principally inseparable from the search of agreement, status, hospitality, and power. It is due to human behavior including economic action and its attributes that should be in accordance with the prevailing norms and obstacles faced by the communities.

Weaving activities in South Sulawesi has experienced a change from traditional and autonomy woven fabric production and distribution to the one with market economy system integration. Production orientation change occurs among the weavers. Woven fabrics that were previously produced to meet the family and customary needs now have changed to meet the market demand to gain profit. Several weaving women entrepreneurs have established boutiques in several regencies/cities in South Sulawesi. Differentiation in weavers' socioeconomic life due to the loom development, which is from *gedogan* to ATBM and ATM, as well as the entry of the market economy system has brought further consequences with the change of entrepreneurial ethics. Three weaver groups that compete each other and live side by side in one area occurred. Each group has differences in the embeddedness of economic action in weaving activities. The competition between the weaving groups is a fair competition. It is interesting to observe since the three groups have different entrepreneurial ethics as a response to the situation they encounter. Three weaver groups who live in one area have different embeddedness of entrepreneurial ethics. Each weaver group has an action socially situated and embedded in the ongoing social and structural relations among actors. The three groups are interconnected and help each other in various social and economic activities. Based on the problem, the research aimed to elaborate on differences and similarities in the embeddedness of entrepreneurial ethics between three weaver women groups in South Sulawesi as a response to the ongoing social and structural relations among actors, which indicates differences in the embeddedness of economic actions in the three weavers' typologies.

The embeddedness theory is one of the theory variances developed in a new economic sociology school of thought. Granovetter (1992a) details the base of the school of thought through three propositions proposed, namely (1) economic action is a form of social action; (2) economic action is socially situated; and (3) social institutions are social constructions. Granovetter's embeddedness theory is a review from various sociology and economic theories and an alternative theory to understand economic action developed in the sociology and economics. Granovetter opines that economic action is socially situated and embedded in the ongoing social and structural relations among actors (Granovetter, 1992b). Economic activities by individuals, groups, and communities are stimulated by social relations as a reality developing in a community. Therefore, the existence of economic institutions does not merely function to bring sellers and buyers together to perform rational transactions or goods and services exchanges but a place for "social values transformation" which has implications for other life aspects, such as economy, politics, culture, and religion.

Granovetter disagrees with the dichotomy of embedded and disembedded concept from Polanyi. Polanyi (Portes, 2010; Smelser dan Swedberg, 1994) states that economic action in pre-industrial society is embedded in social, political, and religious institutions. Reciprocity and redistribution regulate the economic life. In modern society, on the other hand, economic activities are not embedded in society but are regulated by market mechanisms and separated from other social structures (self-regulation market). Granovetter's objection to Polanyi's opinion is related to the level of embeddedness; hence he proposes that economic action happens between over-embedded and under-embedded (Granovetter, 1992a, 1992b)

Granovetter and Swedberg's objection to the embedded and disembedded concept is related to the embeddedness level. Economic action in an industrial community also embeds in social relationship network and other social institutions, such as religion, politics, education, family, and so on (Van Staveren & Knorringa, 2007). For Granovetter, economic action of each community takes place between under-embedded and over-embedded. Therefore, the economic action occurs in a continuum between under-embedded pole and over-embedded pole (Granovetter, 1985).

Entrepreneurship plays a main role in the world economic development. Nevertheless, entrepreneurial activities are usually considered as a male-dominated activity. In the last several years, various studies have indicated that woman role is significantly increasing with up to 42% of entrepreneurs in the world (De Vita, Mari, & Poggesi, 2014; Field, Jayachandran, & Pande, 2010). The gender factor role appears in academic literatures on entrepreneurship at the end of 1970s. For years, attention has been put on analysis of woman entrepreneur characteristics in advanced countries. For the last ten years, however, research results on women entrepreneurship in the third world countries have started to appear in various international journals. Agrawal (2018) findings shows challenges and obstacles faced by woman micro

entrepreneurs in India. Boufeldja (2018) examines women leadership in a variety of small enterprises in Algeria, meanwhile Bamiatzi & Kirchmaier (2014) reveals strategies and financial administration calculation conducted by women in small and medium enterprises. These studies signify business efforts by women in various countries. In addition, becoming a woman entrepreneur would require strong personality and capacity to manage people behavior and attitude in a complex socio-cultural environment. It would need patience, perseverance, communication skills, decision making skills, administration, technical and material issues mastering as well as adapting to unexpected changes (Boufeldja, 2018; Ishwarlall Naicker, 2006; and Salameh, 2016).

## **METHODS**

The research location was in Wajo Regency, which is a center for weaving industrial development of South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. The research was conducted for 6 (six) months from March to August 2019. The research subject determination was conducted through purposive sampling method. The research subject consisted of 7 (seven) women weaving entrepreneurs, 9 (nine) ATBM weaver women, and 15 *gedogan* weaver women.

Methods used in field data collection process included in-depth interview, observation, and focus group discussion. The data analysis method used interactive model from Miles and Huberman that comprised data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing (Huberman & Miles, 2002). Data validity examination was done through time triangulation.

The research employed a constructivist paradigm. The social reality of the entrepreneurial ethics of weaver women could be understood in the form of mental constructions that varied and imperceptible, based on the social situation and experience of the weavers, and local and specific in nature. The relationship between the researcher and the research subjects was transactional and subjective. Dialogue interaction occurred between the researcher and the research subjects. The research was not aimed to verify theories or hypotheses but to gain an explanation of a particular reality that was formed in a certain time (process over time), in a given social context, and can only be captured incompletely or limited (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

The first stage in the qualitative data analysis was the data reduction process that focused on the selection, simplification, abstraction, and transformation of raw data from field records. In this process, data relevant to the research focus and those that did not meet the exclusion and inclusion criteria were selected. The data reduction process was conducted gradually during and after the data collection and until reports were completed. Data reduction was conducted by preparing a data summary, browsing scattered themes, and creating a basic framework for data presentation.

The second stage was data presentation, which is compiling information into a statement that allows conclusion drawing. Data were presented in a narrative text. Data that were initially scattered and separated in various information sources were classified according to the theme and need analysis.

The third stage was conclusion drawing according to data reduction and presentation. Conclusion drawing was gradual from the general conclusion in the data reduction stage to a specific conclusion in the data presentation stage and became more specific in the conclusion drawing stage. This series of processes indicate that qualitative data analysis in the research was combining data reduction stage, data presentation, and conclusion drawing in an interactive and cyclical manner.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Various entrepreneurial ethics of women weavers from the results of research in the field can be described as follows:

### **Mutual Assistance Ethics**

The past socioeconomic life of Bugis-Wajo rural communities was marked with a kinship relationship based on mutual assistance ethics. The phenomenon could be seen in *sibali perri* and *sibali reso* cultures. The *sibali perri* concept refers to mutual assistance attitude to overcome difficulties, whereas the *sibali reso* concept refers to mutual assistance in work. The mutual assistance or *gotong royong* ethics was manifested in various socioeconomic lives of weaver women both in related to a variety of life cycle

events and weaving activity series. As regards the ethics in weavers' socioeconomic life it indicated a shifting symptom. Various weaving activities, such as cotton processing, yarn weaving, and *menganai* that were previously conducted through mutual assistance with neighbors and relatives before the entry of ATBM in 1950, had been replaced by people who were specifically trade goods and services for the activities. Processed yarn has existed and sold in the market thus the women entrepreneurs could easily buy them.

Social differentiation symptoms marked with specialization by involving an activity of exchanging money with goods and services in weaving activities became one of the causes in the waning mutual assistance ethics in the activities. The symptom was in line with Simmel's opinion that money expands individual freedom. Simmel also states the existence of money impacts on group life differentiation (Simmel, at al, 1982). Rationality and economic calculation that occur due to money result in the formation of new groups that pursue economic goals without blood relationship factors as the requirements.

The declining of mutual assistance ethics in the social life of weaver women also took place in the life cycle ceremonies. There were differences in the involvement in various life cycle events both in gratification and grief ceremonies between the three weaver women groups. The involvement was not physical, instead it was manifested through donation of money and goods.

The weaver entrepreneurs preferred running their business if the work must be done immediately rather than attending the gratification life-cycle events conducted by their relatives. They sometimes worked late at night or did not even go home for a week if they must go to other areas to buy yarn or to market their products. Due to this busy life, they were hardly involved directly in the life cycle activities conducted by their neighbors, relatives, and friends. As a consequence, they sent money as a replacement of their physical presence.

The weaver entrepreneurs were social groups that succeeded in upward social mobility in the social structure of contemporary Bugis people. They gained a respectful position in various life cycle events conducted by the communities. As stated by Pelras (1996) that the composition of Bugis elite group at present consists of four groups, namely nobleman (*arung*), scholars/religious leaders (*to panrita*), intellectual/educated people (*to acca*), and rich people /businessmen (*to sugi*).

Differences in the economic level of the three weaver groups were observable in their weaving activity series. Reciprocal and altruism actions could still be found among *gedogan* weavers. The reciprocal action appeared when a *gedogan* weaver run out of yarn that required him/her to ask their neighbor a help. There was no obligation from the borrower to replace the yarn in a certain time. The borrowing and lending activities that occurred among *gedogan* weaver groups was not characterized by profit and loss calculation.

Findings in the field indicate that the involvement of the three weaver groups in Wajo for death rituals is physical and material mutual assistance. Likewise, the three groups volunteer to involve physically and materially in religious celebration. Their involvement in the life cycle related to death is their empathy (*pesse*) to the bereaved families and as a final tribute to the deceased.

The obligation to help others is valued as worship. Helping each other during difficulties in a death ritual embeds in the tradition of *sibali perri* among the Bugis people and in the religious (Islamic) norm followed by the weavers who consider the act as having reward value from God. The act of helping each other in the death ritual and religious ceremonies, such as the birth of the Prophet Muhammad SAW (*Maulid*) and *isra' mi'raj*, in the three weaver groups, show an over-socialized symptom.

The social differentiation took place in the weaving activities involved an exchange of money and services that resulted in mutual assistance among ATBM weavers and weaving entrepreneurs became eroded. The condition has made ATBM weavers' and weaving entrepreneurs' economic action lead to disembedded symptom in the cultural values of Bugis people, especially in *sibali perri* and *sibali reso* ethics or mutual assistance. In accordance with the above description, it could be understood that in every Bugis weaver two action orientations continued to work, namely over socialized (values and norms) and under socialized (personal benefit) (Hitt et al. 2011; Granovetter, 1992a; Meek et al. 2010; Dacin et al. 2010).

## Humanity Ethics

*Sipakatau* (humanize each other human) ethics has a meaning that human has an obligation to respect each other humanity dignity as God creation. Further interpretation of the expression is that to give each

other a decent living. *Sipakalebbi* (mutual respect ethics/glorify each other ethics) means that Bugis people must respect the role and position of each people in the community life structure.

*Gedogan* weavers tended to internalize the ethics in their economic activities. The symptom was indicated by *gedogan* weavers who always lived a humble socioeconomic life. They were happy with the profit they gained through weaving without any efforts to innovate their business development to obtain maximum results. Make a living by weaving, for them, was their effort to meet basic needs. Weaving activity, for them, was an economic activity to kill their leisure time that could generate economic benefits to help their husband to support the family economy (Inanna et.al. 2020). The activity was a safety valve to help the family economy. The research result was in line with (Wickramasekara, 2016; Connell, 2010; Haggblade et al 2010) finding on women contribution to support family economy. It was different from women weaving entrepreneurs who made the weaving as the main business and income source in the family.

The ATBM weavers' economic action tended to be more advanced compared to those of *gedogan* weavers. They had started using a more advanced loom, which was improved handlooms (ATBM). In addition, they also used wage as well as non-wage labors. However, due to market information and capital limitations as well as lack of looms they could not compete with weaving entrepreneurs. Although the weavers seemed to have a simple economic life, they had interest to achieve maximum result from their economic activities. Weaving activity, for them, was the main job to generate economic benefits; however, it had not become the main source of family income. The main source of family income still came from their husband as a farmer or fisherman. This finding was in line with (Anderson & Eswaran, 2009) research results on woman involvement in small business in Birim North District, Ghana and (Muñoz Abeledo, 2012) finding on the involvement of women who worked in industries in Spain in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The economic action conducted by weaving entrepreneurs included establishing capital by way of production intensity and recruiting weaving labors during high order. The weaving entrepreneurs also set fabric price in local level and bought yarn in a large quantity for a certain time. Formal rationality that involves profit and loss calculation became their economic action consideration. The phenomenon was in line with (Curran, Jarvis, Kitching, & Lightfoot, 1997; Mooney, 1986; Zafirovski, 1999) research results. The condition sometimes resulted in local silk yarn scarcity in the market for certain time due to its limited production that accumulated in few weaving entrepreneurs.

## **Honesty**

The weavers always explained the quality of goods they sold to the buyers if they were asked about it. However, they would not explain it if the buyers did not ask about it. Therefore, there were weavers who sold their second quality fabrics with price equal to the first quality fabrics. This action was considered as honest by the weavers and was interpreted as a business strategy to gain profit. The weavers' action for explaining or not explaining the quality of goods they sold was a form of economic rationality to generate profit.

Weaving entrepreneurs in Wajo consistently give large donations for mosque construction, religious celebration, and social activities compared to the other two groups. The entrepreneurs care for and protect their weaving workers by providing them loans when they need them on certain occasions, such as when one of their families is sick. The protection is an over socialized economic action in *sipakatau* (humane) culture of the Bugis-Wajo people.

The *gedogan* weavers interpret weaving activities as leisure time activities; thus, they consider the income received from the activity to be sufficient if it can meet the household needs. The *gedogan* weavers interpret the measure of decency and appropriateness in life if the basic need of their family is met. No further efforts to develop their weaving business. On the contrary, weaving entrepreneurs interpret weaving as a main activity that produces economic profits. They deem obtaining more profit reasonable since they have superiority in the capital, weaving tools, workers, and business networks. For them, decency and appropriateness in life are interpreted as an ability to collect enormous wealth so that their family's life is economically stable and they could help other people. They can participate by giving charity for social and religious activities if they have economic abilities. Therefore, they put maximum effort to gain economic profits so that their family can prosper and they can share with others. Every economic transaction run by the three weaver groups in South Sulawesi was always considered economic profit in one side but there was also empathy element on the other side. There was a paradox

among the weavers where they had to have ethics to help each other but they also must look for economic benefits. The attitude was reflected when the weavers sold a good. They sold the good in cheaper price to their neighbors, relatives and customers but they still looked for profit. On the contrary, they would sell their fabric more expensive to buyers who had no emotional relationship with them. The condition was caused by cultural adjustment that established weavers' rationality action. The rationality actions embedded in *siri* (shame) and *pesse* (empathy) values in Bugis people. The *siri* culture required them to pursue maximum profit to improve their economic condition, whilst *pesse* culture obliged them to help each other. It allowed the maintenance of solidarity and mutual trust in the groups.

According to weavers' understanding trust could be obtained when someone is honest. The symptom was in line with (Welter, 2012; Rose-Ackerman, 2001; Bergh et al. 2011) opinion. Honesty is the main capital to get appreciation from the community. Someone will be exiled in society when he/she is dishonest. When someone is dishonest, he/she would not obtain trust from the community and it could also impact his/her family. Family has a function as a guard of honesty ethics for its each member so that they could obtain trust from others. The role of family to maintain trust was in line with (Shapiro, 1987; Burman, 2004; Moffett, 2006) research results. Weaver women continued to maintain their business network based on honesty ethics for the business sustainability.

### **Risk Taking**

There were differences in economic action regarding risk taking among the three weaver groups. *Gedogan* weavers conducted their weaving activity with orientation of spending their leisure time. In addition, it was also due to cultural orientation that considered the activities as working for eating. They argued that fortune comes from God; therefore, efforts to highlight their cultural orientation would lead to an economic action that they worked merely to meet their basic needs. There is a belief that everyone fortune has been determined by God (Kay, Shepherd, Blatz, Chua, & Galinsky, 2010). It indicates a systematic dependency of worldly life on sacred religion where world is worthless unless it is connected to religion.

The dualistic of work (*reso*) and fate (*were*) reflected that worldly work was not conducted based on efficiency for productive work ethics. The economic action orientation of the *gedogan* weavers embedded in their cultural and religious understanding that considered work (*reso*) and fortune (*dalle*) were determined by God rather than human efforts. Therefore, according to them, work (*reso*) and fortune (*dalle*) did not refer to rational and systematic work (under socialized), instead it referred to the abstract and mysterious bless of God. The symptom was consistent with Stadler (2002) research on Haredi Orthodox Jews case in Israel. Such economic action made sense of Bugis cultural values and religious teachings as obstacles to achieve advancement in economic life.

As regards ATBM weavers' risk-taking ethics, it could be seen through activities of borrowing capital from relatives and selling part of their land or gold to add business capital. The ATBM weavers conducted capital loan to develop their business. The business capital development could also be done with their own savings. It was not, however, accompanied by innovative soul to create woven fabric style and motif that were suitable to market taste. As a consequence, they could not compete with the weaving entrepreneurs in terms of the fabric marketing. The urgency to gain immediate cash to cover their family basic needs and the nonexistence of reserve capital to support the business were among factors that forced them to sell their products when the price was low. It was a difficult choice for the ATBM weavers' to gain minimum profit when they were faced with a condition to meet their family basic needs or to do business with maximum profit but they must endure hunger and shut their business down.

The weaving entrepreneurs always performed rationalization to evaluate the business success or failure. Capital formation was not a forbidden thing in Bugis cultural context as well as in Islam as long as it was conducted honestly and in *halal* way. Through this way, one could help disadvantaged people. A desire to attain achievement through risk taking by selling their land and gold and by borrowing to a banking institution along with creative and innovative attitude was a manifestation that they had an ability to develop values related to efforts to achieve what was needed, in this case, business development to guarantee their future as well as their family.

The weaving entrepreneurs believed that maximum trust and creativity were the power or driver force for success. The research finding was in contrast with statement by (Baba, 2013; Casson & Giusta, 2007; Venkataraman, 2004), that local entrepreneurs had less thinker mentality as reflected in their low ability

to mobilize socioeconomic resources and organize workers systematically to achieve their business goals.

### **Work Ethics and Capital Formation**

Work ethics of the three weaver groups in South Sulawesi did not result in the same capital formation. Time duration used for work did not contribute to the capital formation as well. There were various factors other than work that determine the capital formation, such as capital ability, technology superiority, network formation, and market information.

The weaving activities of household-scale *gedogan* weavers and ATBM weavers had no strict separation between business and household finance as well as the use of family members as either paid or unpaid labors. Therefore, investment might not in the form of business unit development but in their household unit. The form of capital formation in family level was an investment in the form of human resources, especially in child education. Assets purchased were those that could be re-rotated in the household level, such as rice field and gold purchasing. Investment in the form of child education and gold and land purchasing also occurred in small scale farm businessmen in Bangladesh (Ahmed, Allison, & Muir, 2010) and women who worked at garment factories in Bangladesh (Kabeer, 1997).

The *gedogan* weavers spent their time to weave about 6-8 hours a day, on average. They spent 10-12 days to produce one sheet of sarong. People who pursued *gedogan* weaving activity at present were mostly elders, girls who dropped out of school, and girls who graduated from elementary school (SD) or junior high school (SLTP).

Selling price for one sheet of silk sarong in 2019 ranged from Rp. 400,000 to 500,000/sheet. Thus, the *gedogan* weavers could gain profit around Rp. 250,000 – 350,000/sheet after deducting production cost. If they could produce two sheets of silk sarong in a month, they could generate profit of Rp. 500,000-Rp. 700,000/month. The woven fabrics were generally sold to collectors in a price of Rp. 400,000/sheet. The *gedogan* weavers sold their woven fabric products in cash to the collectors who came to village markets. There were also *gedogan* weavers who traded their products to retailers at the district central markets. Due to limitation of Bugis silk fabric marketing that had a relatively expensive price the *gedogan* weavers shifted to *viscos* yarn (yarn similar to silk). The price for Bugis sarong using *viscos* yarn in 2019 were Rp. 150,000-Rp. 170,000. The price of *viscos* yarn to produce one sheet of sarong was around Rp. 30,000; hence, profit gained by the weavers if using the *viscos* yarn was Rp. 120,000-Rp. 140,000/sheet of sarong.

The result from the sales of woven fabrics was mostly used to fulfill the household needs and investment on children life quality improvement through education. There were several *gedogan* weavers who succeeded to send their children up to higher education. The result was in correspond with (Harvie, 2003; Warren-Smith & Jackson, 2004) finding on the amount of women's contribution in micro and medium enterprises to family economy. A condition experienced by the *gedogan* weavers in South Sulawesi was that some of them were unable to perform capital formation in the form of business development and business diversification. Money generated from the sales of woven fabrics was usually used to meet household needs at that time. If there was money left after being used to fulfill household expenses and to purchase weaving materials (yarn and dyes), it would be used for child education cost and social cost preparation. They would incur social costs if they performed or attended a life cycle ceremony at the village.

Weaving activity for ATBM weavers was conducted after all household works (washing, cooking, sweeping, and taking care of husband and children) were done. The ATBM weavers usually woke up around 05:00 and after *fajr* prayer they would take care of all household works. Weaving activity would start at 07:00 or 08:00 AM. By 11:30 they would take a rest for lunch and Dhuhr prayer and they would continue the weaving activity at 13:00 until *Asr* prayer. Following *Asr* prayer, the weaving activity would be continued until 17:00. After Maghrib and Isha prayers and dinner, they would take a rest and continued the weaving activity tomorrow. ATBM weavers spent their time working around 6-8 hours a day. They were able to produce woven fabrics of 4-8 meter/day or it depended on opportunities and motif to be woven. Unlike *gedogan* weavers who only produced sarong fabrics, the ATBM weavers produced various types of fabrics, such as sarong, fabrics for clothes and scarves. The ATBM weavers could generate profit approximately Rp. 600,000 – Rp. 900,000/month.

Capital formation in the ATBM weaver groups had started to take place. It could happen among the ATBM weavers when goods they produced were directly sold in the market. Home-scale ATBM

weavers usually sold their weaving products to retailers at the central market in Sengkang City in two ways, namely cash and consignment. Payment mechanism for the consignment to the retailers was conducted after the goods were sold. If a consignment was chosen, each party holds a note containing types of consigned goods, price agreed, and date of goods delivered by the ATBM weavers to the retailers.

Capital formation among the ATBM weavers also occurred when they became a sub-contractor for the weaving entrepreneurs. If the weaving entrepreneurs received orders in large quantities they would establish partnership with several ATBM weavers who were their relatives or neighbors. The capital formation that occurred among the ATBM weavers was done by buying or renting rice fields, buying gold, saving money in a bank and increasing production quantity. The ATBM weavers usually used their family members or relatives as labors, either as paid or unpaid labors. The action was a manifestation of work load and prosperity division among the family members and neighbors.

Another economic actor who could perform capital formation was weaving entrepreneur groups. The weaving entrepreneur groups, both who had tens or hundreds of weaving labors, were all capable of conducting capital formation. The capital formation among the weaving entrepreneurs in Wajo took place through cooperation mechanism with labors, determination of woven fabric price, capital strength, network strength and the mastering of market information.

Wage determination mechanism was done by the entrepreneurs by setting a wage standard in 2019 of Rp. 3,000-Rp. 4,000/meter and it was agreed by the weaving labors. There was no formal bond in the form of written agreement between the labors and the entrepreneurs. There was, however, mutual trust between both parties to have cooperation based on mutually agreed communication. The use of weaving labors from various villages was a manifestation of the entrepreneur's moral to provide job opportunities and additional income for women who were unemployed during agricultural activities. The weaving labors felt greatly helped with the income from weaving activity since it could assist the family economy when there was no work in agricultural sector.

The weaving entrepreneurs needed labors to support their business. There was an interdependent relation between weaving labors and entrepreneurs. The relationship could be said as a patron-client relationship, which is a relationship that contains certain interest, such as economic dependency of weaving labor (*client*) on the weaving entrepreneurs (*patron*). The entrepreneurs were present to provide job and income guarantee when women did not work and lost their income from agricultural sector. They mostly hired woman labors who came from farmer family in various villages. The patronage relationship was not a rigid one; however, it could be terminated at any time as long as the labors did not have liabilities to their patron, which was the entrepreneurs.

Wage determination mechanism for the weaving labors was similar to pricing determination of woven fabrics. The condition could take place due to the weaving entrepreneurs in South Sulawesi that almost all of them came from one kinship; hence, labor wage determination and fabric pricing was done with *clientization*. *Clientization* in Bugis family was similar to Chinese family where each family member is constantly encouraged to follow the footsteps of successful family or relatives (Cheung & Halpern, 2010). Each family member in Bugis community is always encouraged to compete with their relatives. If there is one successful relative, however, he/she has a moral obligation to help his/her poor relatives. If one family member has a successful business, then other family members try to surpass it to uphold their pride (Pelras & Pelras, 1996). The tradition encouraged every family member to achieve success like other relatives; therefore, it creates a clan entrepreneur in South Sulawesi.

The weaving entrepreneurs as a patron endlessly treated the weaving labors (*client*) who worked for them as part of their big family. The entrepreneurs did not hesitate to help the labors if the labor's family was sick. Goods and foods were often given by the entrepreneurs if the labors needed help. Relationship between the weaving entrepreneurs and the labors was similar to capitalist with human face. It could be interpreted that a company is a big family with labors are considered as part of their own family that must be protected and empowered by the company (West, 1999). The weaving entrepreneurs treated the labors humanely as part of family member. It created high loyalty among the labors to the weaving entrepreneurs.

Capital strength owned by the weaving entrepreneurs allowed them to dominate production and distribution lines of woven fabrics. The condition would further allow more capital formation compared to *gedogan* weavers, ATBM weavers, retailers, and weaving labors groups. The weaving entrepreneurs' ability to develop production and distribution networks, both individually and in groups, as well as

broader social institutions that was not limited to a local area, confirmed their position to appear as a group that was able to conduct capital formation. The research result was in line with findings from several experts that entrepreneur's ability to dominate production and distribution lines generates larger profit (Poschke, 2013; Benz, 2009; Oosterbeek et al. 2010). Broader network also brought further consequences to the entrepreneurs since they became more proficient at woven fabric style and motif that sell well in the market.

Superiority in the number of looms (technology) both ATBM and ATM used in the production activity caused the weaving entrepreneurs to gain larger profit. The condition was supported by the existence of weaving labors who run the looms; hence, the entrepreneurs were more superior in production capability compared to the two other weaving groups. Superiority in woven fabric production further supported the occurrence of capital formation among the weaving entrepreneurs (Bhagavatula, et.al, 2010; Cohen, 1998). Capital formation among the entrepreneurs was manifested through intensification that was demonstrated with an increase in production volume, production quality, business diversification, land and gold buying, child education and savings in the bank.

Despite the three weaver groups that equally viewed work as an obligation and fortune that came from God, their ethics were different. *Gedogan* weavers' ethics was to produce with orientation to fulfill the needs, and it tended to be fatalistic. It was due to the belief that failure and success in worldly life was God's way to divide fortunate and fate according to His will. ATBM weavers' and weaving entrepreneurs' ethics, on the other hand, was to not surrender to good or bad fate, but they always conducted rationalization through evaluation on work that had been done. There were efforts to continuously look for causes and effects that could make them successful or fail in business. Fate, for them, could be improved through rational works and transcendental religious ritual works (worship and pray).

For the weaving entrepreneurs, who were generally had been conducted *hajj* (pilgrimage to Mecca), the weaving activities were directed to two purposes at once, namely fulfilling the worldly and afterlife needs. Thrift attitude against the result of hard work was not merely for capital accumulation purpose. The generated profit could also be allocated for spiritual interests, which was to get closer to God. This finding was in line with studies from Geertz (1963) and Lenggono (2011). Geertz's (1963) research results on *santri* entrepreneurs in Mojokuto indicated that there was asceticism among Muslim entrepreneurs. Muslim entrepreneurs appeared as a driver of economic activities from small trading towards a firm economy through asceticism ethics. Lenggono (2011), on the other hand, found that there was an ethics followed by farm capitalists among Bugis ethnic in Samarinda that hard work conducted was not merely intended for business development but it was also allocated for social and religious activities as part of obtaining protection from God in the afterlife.

For the weaving entrepreneurs, the accumulated capital was not only intended to improve their social status and obtain influence in the community but also to reach God's blessing in the afterlife. They not only were involved in mosque development, but also performed *hajj* (pilgrimage), made sacrifice, and sympathized with the poor. They obtained legitimacy to be considered as pious people in religious life; thus, they deserved to be a role model.

**Table 1.** Comparison of Entrepreneurial Ethics of Weaver Women in Wajo Regency

Type of Weaver	Entrepreneurial Ethics					Work Ethics and Capital Formation
	Mutual Assistance Ethics	Humanity Ethics	Honesty	Risk Taking		
Gedogan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Use gedogan loom</li> <li>✓ Family labor</li> <li>✓ Stop weaving activities and choose to be physically involved in helping society in various life cycles</li> <li>✓ No economic calculation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Look for profit but no business innovation and development to gain maximum profit. Use family members as a labor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Honest.</li> <li>✓ Explain product quality.</li> <li>✓ Sell goods to family and neighbors at cheap prices and sell goods according to the standard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Risk-averse.</li> <li>✓ Have no courage to borrow money to develop business.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Hard worker.</li> <li>✓ Order-based production.</li> <li>✓ Profit from weaving is used for children's education costs and to meet family needs.</li> <li>✓ Only produce Bugis sarongs.</li> </ul>	

Type of Weaver	Entrepreneurial Ethics					Work Ethics and Capital Formation
	Mutual Assistance Ethics	Humanity Ethics	Honesty	Risk Taking		
	regarding the lending of equipment and weaving threads			price to regular consumers. ✓ Production results are sold to consumers and traders at local markets. ✓ On-time in completing orders		
ATBM weaver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Use ATBM about 1 – 7 units.</li> <li>✓ Stop the weaving activities and physically involve in helping family and neighbors in various life cycles</li> <li>✓ No economic calculation regarding the lending of equipment and weaving threads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Live a simple life.</li> <li>✓ Look for maximum profit.</li> <li>✓ Use labor from family and neighbors or relatives (paid labor)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Honest.</li> <li>✓ Explain the product quality if buyers ask.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Willing to take a risk by borrowing from relatives for business development but not from the bank</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Hard worker.</li> <li>✓ Market-oriented production.</li> <li>✓ Produce Bugis sarongs and other motifs.</li> <li>✓ Produce various motifs</li> </ul>	
Weaving entrepreneurs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Own tens to hundreds of ATBM and even ATM</li> <li>✓ Accentuate in running their business than physically involve in social activities in the community's life cycles yet they compensate for it with material assistance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Weaving activities are the main maximum-profit producer.</li> <li>✓ Use paid labor in a patronage relationship.</li> <li>✓ The entrepreneurs care to share food and goods with the workers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Honest.</li> <li>✓ Explain the product quality if buyers ask.</li> <li>✓ Being on-time in meeting fabric orders from customers.</li> <li>✓ The production results are sold to consumers and traders at local markets.</li> <li>✓ Production results are always available.</li> <li>✓ Own a settled place to sell goods.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Dare to take risks by borrowing money from the bank and selling gold to develop business.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Hard worker.</li> <li>✓ Capital formation is manifested through children's education, gold purchase, business development, and production intensity.</li> <li>✓ Some of the profits are allocated for donations to social and religious activities.</li> <li>✓ The weaving results are used for pilgrimage with wife and children.</li> </ul>	

Source: Field data, processed 2021.

The above table shows that the embeddedness of entrepreneurial ethics of *gedogan* weavers tends to the over-embedded action where in the weaving activities it is more embedded in the cultural and religious values of the Bugis people. Only a few of the entrepreneurial ethics of the *gedogan* weavers are embedded in the under-embedded action where they realize that the weaving activities can provide economic profit since they can help their family economy and finance their children's education. The

embeddedness of entrepreneurial ethics of ATBM weavers is mostly in the continuum. The women entrepreneurs' ethics, however, is more directed to the under-embedded and only some of their action lead to the over-embedded. The research supports Granovetter's Embeddedness Theory where the economic action of each community occurs between under-embedded and over-embedded. Thus, economic action occurs in the continuum between the under-embedded pole and the over-embedded pole.

The research findings suggest a difference to embeddedness theory from Granovetter, (1992a, 1985) stating that the action of economic actors always works between the under socialized pole (rational economic action with orientation to individual achievement (self-interest)) and over socialized pole (economic action is led by rules of values and norms). Granovetter's embeddedness theory seems to view values and norms, culture and religion as static. The research findings, however, indicate differences in the interpretation of the three weaver groups towards values and norms and their religion. The condition implies that values and norms as well as religious dogma open an opportunity for re-interpretation according to the orientation of action of each economic actor.

The research results indicate that although economic actions conducted by the weavers are embedded in their culture and religion, the reality shows that economic actions in interpreting work (*reso*) and fate (*were*) as part of cultural values and religious dogma followed by Bugis people are different between the three weaver types. The condition occurs because culture and religious dogma provide space for re-interpretation.

The research result is consistent with those of Jamilah et al., (2016) on three typologies of embroidery entrepreneurs in Tasikmalaya. The result shows that over-embedded in Islamic values and under-embedded in ethics of Sundanese culture existed among Islamic-Sundanese entrepreneur type. Over-embedded in Sundanese cultural values and under-embedded in Islamic values found in the Sundanese-Islamic entrepreneur type. Moreover, over-embedded in modern economic ethics and under-embedded in Islamic and Sundanese ethics were identified among the capitalist entrepreneur type.

The research further develops the embeddedness theory from Granovetter. The research found a mix-rationality action that refers to a socio-economic action performed by weavers in Wajo by combining over socialized and under socialized or over-embedded and under-embedded actions in one action. Gedogan weavers emphasize cultural values in producing woven fabric; however, they want to gain economic profit from their production. Capital collection by weaving entrepreneurs is not merely directed to play a major role in world affairs (business development) but is also used to help others in social and religious activities. The weaving entrepreneurs who have stronger economic power than the two other types of weavers do not necessarily shut down and exploit weaker weavers but they partner with the ATBM and gedogan weavers. The partnership involves solidarity (moral) and provides economic profits for each party

## CONCLUSION

Weaving technology development and the entry of market economy system in the people weaving activities in South Sulawesi initiated the occurrence of three weaving groups, namely: *gedogan* weavers, ATBM weavers, and weaving entrepreneurs. Each group had different entrepreneurial ethics. The *gedogan* weavers' response towards weaving technology development and market intervention indicated that they were embedded to Bugis values that highly uphold ethics of mutual assistance, humanize and respect each other, and honesty. They were still consistent in using traditional looms. The entrepreneurial ethics developed by the *gedogan* weavers was very strong and it was not easily affected by price fluctuations occurred in the market. Their consistency to produce traditional woven fabrics that were full of cultural values had a very strong resistance towards the entry of textile products produced by textile capitalist that operated in the local, national and global areas in the Bugis-Wajo people.

The ATBM weavers in Wajo were weaver groups that were most vulnerable to business setbacks or shut down compared to the other two weaver groups. Even though their entrepreneurial ethics were still in over socialized pole (based on Bugis people's cultural values), part of their economic action experienced a shift towards interdependent action with other economic actors. The shift in economic action resulted in an intense competition between the economic actors in terms of capital formation. The ATBM weavers had started to produce fabrics based on market taste. Yet, they had not been able to compete with the weaving entrepreneurs in local market regarding quantity and quality, particularly with textile products produced by national and global capitalists. In addition, the ATBM weavers who produced

Bugis traditional woven fabric (cultural product) also could not compete with products produced by *gedogan* weaving in terms of the quality. The attachment of ATBM weavers to capital was also an obstacle for they could not compete with local, national, and global capitalists.

The weaving entrepreneur was a party that got the most economic surplus in weaving activities in Wajo at present. Their entrepreneurial ethics mostly led to under-socialized pole compared to the other two groups. Only some of their economic action that was still embedded to Bugis values. Although there were eroded social solidarity values, such as mutual assistance in various life cycles, other social values, such as donation for social-religious activities experienced reinforcement. The capital formation that occurred among the group was not directed to play more roles in material affairs, but they shared with others, especially in social-religious activities.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acs, Z. J., Song, A. K., Szerb, L., Audretsch, D. B., & Komlosi, E. (2021). The evolution of the global digital platform economy: 1971–2021. *Small Business Economics*, 57(4), 1629–1659. DOI: 10.1007/s11187-021-00561-x.
- Agrawal, R. (2018). Constraints and Challenges Faced by Women Entrepreneurs in Emerging Market Economy and the Way Forward. *Journal of Women's Entrepreneurship and Education*, 3(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.28934/jwee18.34.pp1-19>
- Ahmed, N., Allison, E. H., & Muir, J. F. (2010). Rice fields to prawn farms: a blue revolution in southwest Bangladesh? *Aquaculture International*, 18(4), 555–574. DOI: 10.1007/s10499-009-9276-0
- Anderson, S., & Eswaran, M. (2009). What determines female autonomy? Evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Development Economics*, 90(2), 179–191. DOI: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2008.10.004.
- Arsita, M., Zuber, A., & Demartoto, A. (2020). The Social Embeddedness of MSMEs Goyor Woven Sarong in Sambirembe Village, Kalijambe, Sragen. *Society*, 8(2), 359–371. DOI: 10.33019/society.v8i2.198.
- Baba, G. K. (2013). The challenges of entrepreneurship development in Nigeria and way forward. *Journal of Business and Organizational Development*, 5(1), 54–64.
- Bamiatzi, V. C., & Kirchmaier, T. (2014). Strategies for superior performance under adverse conditions: A focus on small and medium-sized high-growth firms. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(3), 259–284. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.1332087.
- Benz, M. (2009). Entrepreneurship as a non-profit-seeking activity. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 5(1), 23–44. DOI: 10.1007/s11365-006-0031-y
- Bergh, P., Thorgren, S., & Wincent, J. (2011). Entrepreneurs learning together: The importance of building trust for learning and exploiting business opportunities. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(1), 17–37. DOI: 10.1007/s11365-009-0120-9.
- Bhagavatula, S., Elfring, T., Van Tilburg, A., & Van De Bunt, G. G. (2010). How social and human capital influence opportunity recognition and resource mobilization in India's handloom industry. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(3), 245–260. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.10.006.
- Boufeldja, G. (n.d.). *Women as Entrepreneurship in Algeria*. 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.28934/jwee18.34.pp34-44>
- Brush, C. G., & Cooper, S. Y. (2012). Female entrepreneurship and economic development: An international perspective. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(1–2), 1–6. DOI: 10.1080/08985626.2012.637340.
- Burman, S. (2004). Revisiting the agent of social control role: Implications for substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 18(2), 197–209. DOI: 10.1080/0265053042000231016.
- Carter, D. A., Simkins, B. J., & Simpson, W. G. (2003). Corporate governance, board diversity, and

- firm value. *Financial Review*, 38(1), 33–53. DOI: 10.1111/1540-6288.00034.
- Casson, M., & Giusta, M. Della. (2007). Entrepreneurship and social capital: Analysing the impact of social networks on entrepreneurial activity from a rational action perspective. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(3), 220–244. DOI: 10.1177/0266242607076524.
- Cheung, F. M., & Halpern, D. F. (2010). Women at the top: Powerful leaders define success as work+ family in a culture of gender. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 182. DOI: 10.1037/a0017309.
- Cohen, J. H. (1998). Craft production and the challenge of the global market: An artisans' cooperative in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Human Organization*, 74–82. DOI: 10.17730/humo.57.1.g3m5038h835r77lm.
- Connell, J. (2010). Pacific islands in the global economy: Paradoxes of migration and culture. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 31(1), 115–129. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9493.2010.00387.x.
- Curran, J., Jarvis, R., Kitching, J., & Lightfoot, G. (1997). The pricing decision in small firms: complexities and the deprioritising of economic determinants. *International Small Business Journal*, 15(2), 17–32. DOI: 10.1177/02662426971520.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 37–57. DOI: 10.5465/amp.24.3.37.
- De Vita, L., Mari, M., & Poggesi, S. (2014). Women entrepreneurs in and from developing countries: Evidences from the literature. *European Management Journal*, 32(3), 451–460. DOI: 10.1016/j.emj.2013.07.009.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. sage.
- Eslam, M., Sanyal, A. J., George, J., Sanyal, A., Neuschwander-Tetri, B., Tiribelli, C., ... Yki-Järvinen, H. (2020). MAFLD: a consensus-driven proposed nomenclature for metabolic associated fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology*, 158(7), 1999–2014.
- Field, E., Jayachandran, S., & Pande, R. (2010). Do traditional institutions constrain female entrepreneurship? A field experiment on business training in India. *American Economic Review*, 100(2), 125–129. DOI: 10.1257/aer.100.2.125.
- Geertz, C. (1963). *Peddlers and princes: Social development and economic change in two Indonesian towns* (Vol. 318). University of Chicago Press.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481–510. DOI: 10.1086/228311.
- Granovetter, M. (1992a). *Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness dalam M. Granovetter dan R. Swedberg (Eds). The Sociology of Economic Life*. Westview Press Inc. Boulder-San Fransisco-Oxford.
- Granovetter, M. (1992b). Economic institutions as social constructions: a framework for analysis. *Acta Sociologica*, 35(1), 3–11. DOI: 10.1177/000169939203500101.
- Grine, F., Fares, D., & Meguellati, A. (2015). Islamic spirituality and entrepreneurship: A case study of women entrepreneurs in Malaysia. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 41–56.
- Haggblade, S., Hazell, P., & Reardon, T. (2010). The rural non-farm economy: Prospects for growth and poverty reduction. *World Development*, 38(10), 1429–1441. DOI: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.06.008.
- Harvie, C. (2003). *The contribution of micro-enterprises to economic recovery and poverty alleviation in East Asia*.
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., Sirmon, D. G., & Trahms, C. A. (2011). Strategic entrepreneurship: creating value for individuals, organizations, and society. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(2), 57–75. DOI: 10.2139/SSRN.1994491.
- Huberman, M., & Miles, M. B. (2002). *The qualitative researcher's companion*. Sage.
- Inanna, I., Rahmatullah, R., Haeruddin, M., & Marhawati, M. (2020). Silk weaving as a cultural heritage

- in the informal entrepreneurship education perspective. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 23(1), 1–11.
- Isaga, N. (2019). Start-up motives and challenges facing female entrepreneurs in Tanzania. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 11(2), 102–119. DOI: 10.1108/IJGE-02-2018-0010.
- Ishwarlall Naicker, N. (2006). *Factors contributing to women being successful in the SMME sector*. University of Johannesburg.
- Jamilah, J., Dharmawan, A. H., Panjaitan, N. K., & Damanhuri, D. S. (2016). Embeddedness of Moral and Culture Institutions with Embroidery Entrepreneurship in Tasikmalaya. *Sodality: Jurnal Sosiologi Pedesaan*, 4(3). DOI: 10.22500/sodality.v4i3.14432.
- Kabeer, N. (1997). Women, wages and intra-household power relations in urban Bangladesh. *Development and Change*, 28(2), 261–302. DOI: 10.1111/1467-7660.00043.
- Kay, A. C., Shepherd, S., Blatz, C. W., Chua, S. N., & Galinsky, A. D. (2010). For God (or) country: the hydraulic relation between government instability and belief in religious sources of control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(5), 725. DOI: 10.1037/a0021140.
- Langowitz, N., & Minniti, M. (2007). The entrepreneurial propensity of women. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3), 341–364. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00177.x.
- Lenggono, P. S. (2011). Ponggawa dan Patronase Pertambakan di Delta Mahakam: Teori Pembentukan Ekonomi Lokal. *Disertasi SPD-IPB*.
- Mahajar, A. J. Bin, & Yunus, J. B. M. (2012). Factors that encourage women involvement in SMEs in Pahang, Malaysia. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 8(2), 33.
- Meek, W. R., Pacheco, D. F., & York, J. G. (2010). The impact of social norms on entrepreneurial action: Evidence from the environmental entrepreneurship context. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 493–509. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.09.007.
- Minniti, M. (2005). Entrepreneurship and network externalities. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 57(1), 1–27. DOI: 10.1016/j.jebo.2004.10.002.
- Moffett, H. (2006). ‘These women, they force us to rape them’: Rape as narrative of social control in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 32(1), 129–144. DOI: 10.1080/03057070500493845.
- Mooney, P. H. (1986). Farming, rationality, and craftship: Beyond X-efficiency. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 3(4), 54–58. DOI: 10.1007/BF01535485.
- Muñoz Abeledo, L. (2012). Women in the rural and industrial labor force in nineteenth-century Spain. *Feminist Economics*, 18(4), 121–144. DOI: 10.1080/13545701.2012.738302.
- Oosterbeek, H., Van Praag, M., & Ijsselstein, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review*, 54(3), 442–454. DOI: 10.1016/J.euroecorev.2009.08.002.
- Orser, B., & Elliott, C. (2015). *Feminine Capital: Unlocking the power of women entrepreneurs*. Stanford University Press.
- Pelras, C., & Pelras. (1996). *The Bugis*. Blackwell Publishers Oxford.
- Portes, A. (2010). Economic sociology. In *Economic Sociology*. Princeton University Press.
- Poschke, M. (2013). Who becomes an entrepreneur? Labor market prospects and occupational choice. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 37(3), 693–710. DOI: 10.1016/j.jedc.2012.11.003.
- Roomi, M. A. (2009). Impact of social capital development and use in the growth process of women-owned firms. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 17(04), 473–495. DOI: 10.1142/S0218495809000436.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (2001). Trust and honesty in post-socialist societies. *Kyklos*, 54(2-3), 415–443. DOI: 10.1111/j.0023-5962.2001.00161.x.
- Salameh, M. S. (2016). *Palestinian women entrepreneurs: an exploratory study of intentions relatedness*

to business sustainability.

- Seelos, C., Mair, J., Battilana, J., & Tina Dacin, M. (2011). *The embeddedness of social entrepreneurship: Understanding variation across local communities*. DOI: 10.1108/S0733-558X(2011)0000033013.
- Shapiro, S. P. (1987). The social control of impersonal trust. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(3), 623–658. DOI: 10.1086/228791.
- Simmel, G., Accarino, B., & Ferrarotti, F. (1982). *La differenziazione sociale*. Laterza Roma-Bari.
- Stadler, N. (2002). Is profane work an obstacle to salvation? The case of Ultra Orthodox (Haredi) Jews in contemporary Israel. *Sociology of Religion*, 63(4), 455–474. DOI: 10.2307/3712302.
- Syukur, M. (2014). Transformasi Penenun Bugis Wajo Menuju Era Modernitas. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 24(1). DOI: 10.15294/paramita.v24i1.2864.
- Udofot, P., & John, N. E. (2017). Ethical Sensitivity and Success of Female Entrepreneurs in Akwa Ibom State of Nigeria. *Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 2(3), 179–184. DOI: 10.21276/sjbms.2017.2.3.9.
- Van Staveren, I., & Knorringa, P. (2007). Unpacking social capital in economic development: How social relations matter. *Review of Social Economy*, 65(1), 107–135. DOI: 10.1080/00346760601132147.
- Venkataraman, S. (2004). Regional transformation through technological entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(1), 153–167. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2003.04.001.
- Warren-Smith, I., & Jackson, C. (2004). Women creating wealth through rural enterprise. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 10 (6). DOI: 10.1108/13552550410564707.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (Vol. 1). Univ of California Press.
- Welter, F. (2012). All you need is trust? A critical review of the trust and entrepreneurship literature. *International Small Business Journal*, 30(3), 193–212. DOI: 10.1177/0266242612439588.
- West, C. C. (1999). *Power, Truth, and Community in Modern Culture*. A&C Black.
- Wickramasekara, P. (2016). South Asian Gulf migration to the Gulf: a safety valve or a development strategy? *Migration and Development*, 5(1), 99–129. DOI: 10.1080/21632324.2015.1039770.
- Zafirovski, M. (1999). Profit-making as social action: An alternative social-economic perspective. *Review of Social Economy*, 57(1), 47–83. DOI: 10.1080/003467699000000026.