

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

Maya Desvita¹, Yoseph Budi Kurniawan²

^{1,2}PT Pertamina Patra Niaga Integrated Terminal Jakarta

ABSTRACT: Urban communities face interconnected challenges related to livelihoods, waste management, social inclusion, and access to productive resources. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has increasingly moved beyond short-term assistance toward approaches that seek to generate shared social, economic, and environmental value. This study examines the Eco Superstar Program implemented by PT Pertamina Patra Niaga Integrated Terminal Jakarta as a CSR-based social innovation initiative in Sunter Jaya, North Jakarta, Indonesia. The study aims to explore how CSR can enable the reconfiguration of community resources, relationships, and activities into an integrated urban circular system. A qualitative case study approach was employed, using program documentation, field observations, interviews, community-related records, and supporting secondary data. The findings indicate that the social innovation of Eco Superstar lies not primarily in the individual activities or technologies introduced, but in the way previously separate community actors and resources are connected through circular value creation. Food-processing activities, organic waste utilization, urban farming, environmentally responsible packaging, and environmental learning are linked to create relationships among production, resource recovery, local markets, and community participation. The program also demonstrates that circular economy practices can function as a mechanism for social inclusion by creating differentiated roles for women, older community members, low-income groups, and children. Furthermore, the gradual strengthening of organizational capacity, productive assets, market access, and community responsibilities indicates a shift from beneficiary-oriented assistance toward greater community agency. The case suggests that CSR can serve as an enabling platform for urban social innovation when interventions are embedded in existing community practices and designed to connect environmental, economic, and social objectives. The study contributes a context-sensitive perspective on how CSR can facilitate urban circularity through community-based resource integration and inclusive participation.

KEYWORDS: Corporate social responsibility, social innovation, circular economy, community empowerment, urban sustainability, community participation, Jakarta

I. INTRODUCTION

Urban communities are often confronted with several problems at the same time. Limited access to productive resources, unstable household livelihoods, unmanaged waste, and the lack of adequate space for community activities can occur within the same neighbourhood. These problems are rarely independent of one another. In many cases, economic activities generate waste, while the waste itself is treated as a burden rather than as a resource that can be returned to the local economy. At the same time, community groups may already have skills, social networks, and productive activities, but operate separately without strong connections between them. Such conditions are particularly relevant in densely populated urban areas, where land and natural resources are limited but the volume of consumption and waste continues to increase.

This situation has also changed the way Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is understood. CSR is no longer viewed only as a form of corporate contribution through donations, infrastructure assistance, or short-term community support. Increasingly, CSR is expected to respond to social and environmental challenges while creating opportunities for communities to develop their own capacities. Porter and Kramer (2011), for example, emphasize the relationship between business activities and social value creation, while more recent discussions of social innovation place greater attention on new forms of collaboration, relationships, and collective action in addressing social problems. From this perspective, the value of CSR is not only determined by what resources a company provides, but also by how those resources are connected with local knowledge, community initiatives, institutions, and existing assets.

The idea of social innovation is particularly relevant to this discussion. Social innovation refers to new or reconfigured ways of addressing social needs through changes in relationships, practices, and forms of collaboration (Murray et al., 2010; Howaldt & Schwarz, 2017). Innovation in this sense does not necessarily mean the introduction of sophisticated technology or an entirely new

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

product. It may emerge when existing resources are reorganized and previously disconnected actors begin to work together around a shared problem. This perspective provides an opportunity to look at CSR programs differently. Rather than asking only whether a CSR intervention produces measurable benefits, it is also important to examine how the intervention changes the relationships between community actors and how it enables resources that were previously underutilized to circulate within the community.

The circular economy perspective strengthens this argument. Circular economy approaches seek to reduce resource loss by maintaining the value of materials and products for as long as possible through reuse, recovery, recycling, and other forms of resource circulation. In a community setting, however, circularity is not simply a technical matter of managing waste. It also depends on people, institutions, skills, and local economic relationships. Waste can become a productive input only when there are actors who can process it, knowledge to support its use, places where it can be utilized, and markets or activities that can create value from it. Circularity therefore has a social dimension, particularly when local communities are involved in determining how resources are used and how the resulting benefits are distributed.

This perspective is reflected in the Eco Superstar Program implemented by PT Pertamina Patra Niaga Integrated Terminal Jakarta in Sunter Jaya, North Jakarta. The program developed through several community groups with different activities and characteristics, including small food and beverage businesses, an elderly community group, a community-based waste bank, urban farming activities, and children's environmental education. Initially, these activities did not necessarily form a single system. Their potential became more visible as connections were developed between community activities, waste streams, productive assets, knowledge, and local consumption. Organic waste, for instance, could be redirected toward agricultural activities, while agricultural products could in turn support local food-processing activities. Other materials could be transformed into environmentally responsible packaging, creating another connection between waste management and economic activity.

The case therefore raises a question that goes beyond whether the program improved community welfare or reduced waste. The more important question is how CSR can create the conditions for such connections to emerge and develop. In this context, the company does not act simply as a provider of resources, while community members are not merely recipients of assistance. CSR can instead function as an enabling platform that brings different actors together, supports the development of capacities and productive assets, and facilitates relationships through which community resources can be exchanged and reused. This shift is important because the continuity of a community initiative may depend less on the continuation of external assistance and more on whether communities are able to build relationships and capabilities that allow the system to function over time.

Previous studies on the Eco Superstar Program have primarily discussed it from the perspective of urban community development and green economy, including the integration of economic, social, and environmental activities. This study approaches the same program from a different analytical perspective. Rather than treating the program primarily as a green-economy intervention, this research examines Eco Superstar as a case of urban circular social innovation enabled through CSR. The focus is placed on the processes through which fragmented community activities become connected, how resources are circulated across activities, how different community members participate, and how these relationships contribute to greater community agency.

Accordingly, this study aims to explore how CSR can enable the emergence of an urban circular social innovation system through the Eco Superstar Program in Sunter Jaya, North Jakarta. The study pays particular attention to three related processes: the reconnection of community actors and local resources, the development of circular value creation through community activities, and the gradual shift from beneficiary-oriented assistance toward greater community participation and agency. By examining these processes, the study seeks to contribute to the discussion of CSR not merely as a mechanism for delivering social programs, but as an enabling approach that can support locally grounded social innovation and circularity in urban communities.

The study contributes to the literature in two ways. First, it provides a community-level perspective on the relationship between CSR and social innovation by highlighting the importance of relationships and resource integration rather than focusing only on program outputs. Second, it shows how circular economy practices can become socially meaningful when they are embedded in existing community activities and supported by collaborative relationships. The Eco Superstar case illustrates that urban circularity can develop not only through technological solutions, but also through the gradual reorganization of people, resources, knowledge, and local economic activities.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has increasingly developed from a primarily philanthropic concept into a broader approach through which companies engage with social and environmental challenges. In community-based settings, CSR can provide resources, knowledge, infrastructure, and access to networks that are difficult for local groups to develop independently. However, the presence of corporate resources does not automatically create sustainable community change. The way these resources are connected with local capacities, institutions, and community initiatives is equally important. Widhagdhya et al. (2022), in their review of CSR-based community development in Indonesia, show that community empowerment has become an important direction in CSR practice, with different models emerging according to local conditions. This suggests that CSR should be understood not only

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

in terms of what a company gives to a community, but also in terms of how the intervention creates opportunities for communities to participate, learn, organize, and develop productive relationships.

A useful perspective for understanding this process is to view CSR as an enabling mechanism rather than simply an intervention. An enabling role means that the company helps create conditions in which community actors can access resources, build relationships, experiment with new practices, and gradually take greater responsibility for activities. This perspective is particularly relevant to CSR programs that involve several community groups rather than a single beneficiary group. In such situations, the contribution of CSR may lie in connecting actors who previously worked separately and in creating spaces where their resources and capacities can complement one another. Recent research on CSR and community-based sustainable development in Indonesia similarly highlights the importance of stakeholder engagement, long-term planning, and mechanisms that allow community initiatives to develop beyond short-term assistance.

The concept of social innovation provides a second lens for examining such processes. Social innovation is concerned with changes in social practices, relationships, and forms of cooperation that respond to social needs. Howaldt and Schwarz (2017) argue that social innovation should be understood through the interaction between actors, social practices, cultural contexts, and processes of social change. From this perspective, innovation does not necessarily require a completely new technology or product. It can emerge when existing practices are reorganized and new relationships between actors are created. This distinction is important for community-based CSR because many program innovations are built from resources that already exist locally. The innovation may therefore be found in the way people collaborate and combine resources rather than in the novelty of an individual activity.

This understanding also helps distinguish social innovation from conventional program improvement. Adding new equipment, providing training, or introducing a new product may improve the performance of an existing activity, but it does not necessarily constitute social innovation. Social innovation becomes more visible when an intervention changes how community actors relate to one another or how a local problem is collectively addressed. In the context of CSR, this means that the analytical focus should move beyond individual outputs and examine whether new patterns of collaboration, participation, and resource exchange are emerging. A study of CSR-based social innovation in Indonesia, for example, identified collaboration and the combination of social responsibility approaches as important conditions supporting social innovation in community empowerment practices.

The third concept relevant to this study is the circular economy (CE). Conventional discussions of circular economy commonly emphasize reducing resource consumption, extending product lifecycles, recovering materials, and minimizing waste. Although these principles are important, a purely technical understanding of circularity may overlook the role of communities in creating and maintaining circular practices. Urban circularity depends not only on material flows but also on people who collect, process, reuse, transform, exchange, and consume resources. Therefore, circularity can also be understood as a social process in which communities reorganize the relationship between resources, activities, and local needs.

The connection between social innovation and circular economy has received increasing attention. A study of urban social housing communities found that social innovation can support alternative production and consumption practices and contribute to resource circularity. The study also emphasized that community-based social innovation can complement more technology-oriented approaches to circular economy implementation. This perspective is relevant to the present study because the Eco Superstar Program does not rely on a single circular technology. Instead, circularity develops through connections between food production, waste utilization, urban farming, packaging, learning, and community participation. The circular process is therefore embedded in everyday community activities.

The social dimension of circular economy becomes particularly important in developing-country contexts. Recent research on Indonesia argues that community-based circular practices should not be examined only through material efficiency because they are also associated with livelihoods, social cohesion, environmental conditions, health, and empowerment. Saefullah et al. (2026) identify these dimensions as interconnected outcomes of community-level circular economy practices in Indonesian urban and informal-settlement contexts. Their findings also question the suitability of highly technocentric circular economy frameworks for explaining grassroots practices in the Global South. This argument provides an important foundation for examining Eco Superstar as a social rather than purely technical form of circularity.

The relationship between circular economy and social inclusion is also increasingly discussed in the literature. Circular practices can create opportunities for groups that may have limited access to formal employment or productive assets, particularly when activities are organized around local skills and resources. A recent systematic review of social innovation in developing regions highlights community engagement, grassroots entrepreneurship, institutional support, and multi-actor collaboration as important elements in making circular economy practices more inclusive. In this sense, circularity can provide more than an environmental function. It can create spaces in which different community members contribute according to their capabilities and circumstances.

The Indonesian context further demonstrates the practical connection between CSR, circular economy, and community empowerment. Studies of CSR initiatives have shown how waste that was previously regarded as a problem can become an input for new products or productive activities when communities receive the necessary knowledge, organizational support, and access to resources. For example, research on a CSR-based onion waste management program in Indonesia describes how low-quality

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

agricultural waste was transformed into an input for a new community-based product through a qualitative empowerment process. More recent Indonesian research has similarly examined circular economy practices within CSR as a pathway for strengthening skills, social capital, alternative livelihoods, and collective agency. These studies suggest that resource recovery and community empowerment do not have to be treated as separate program components; they can reinforce one another when designed as part of the same local system.

Taken together, these perspectives indicate that the relationship between CSR, social innovation, and circular economy can be understood as a process rather than as three separate concepts. CSR can provide an enabling structure through which resources, knowledge, networks, and institutional support become available. Social innovation describes the changes in relationships and practices that emerge when community actors begin to work differently. Circular economy provides a practical context in which these new relationships can be expressed through the circulation and re-use of materials, knowledge, products, and productive resources. Community participation and agency connect the three perspectives because circular practices are more likely to become locally meaningful when communities are involved not only as beneficiaries but also as actors in the process.

This conceptual relationship provides the analytical basis for examining the Eco Superstar Program. Instead of evaluating the program primarily through the amount of income generated, the quantity of waste processed, or the number of beneficiaries, this study examines how the program reorganizes relationships between community groups and local resources. Particular attention is given to the mechanisms through which previously separate activities become connected, how materials and knowledge move between activities, how different groups participate in the emerging system, and how responsibility gradually shifts toward community actors. The literature therefore suggests that the key issue is not whether CSR can deliver individual benefits, but under what conditions CSR can enable communities to create and sustain new forms of collaboration and circular value creation.

Based on this perspective, the study positions Eco Superstar at the intersection of three analytical dimensions: CSR as an enabling platform, social innovation as a process of reorganizing relationships and practices, and circular economy as a mechanism for connecting resource recovery with community value creation. This framework distinguishes the present study from conventional CSR impact assessments and from approaches that treat circular economy mainly as a technical waste-management strategy. It allows the program to be examined as an urban social innovation process in which environmental practices, economic activities, and community relationships develop together.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative case study approach to examine how Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can enable the development of urban circular social innovation. The qualitative approach was selected because the study sought to understand the process through which community activities, relationships, and local resources were connected and developed over time, rather than primarily measuring the program through predetermined quantitative indicators. The case examined was the Eco Superstar Program implemented by PT Pertamina Patra Niaga Integrated Terminal Jakarta in Sunter Jaya, North Jakarta, Indonesia. The program was selected because it involved several community groups with different activities and characteristics, including small-scale food and beverage businesses, elderly community activities, community-based waste management, urban farming, and environmental education. These activities initially developed within their respective groups but gradually became connected through the program, providing a relevant context for examining the relationship between CSR, social innovation, and circular economy practices.

Data were obtained from primary and secondary sources. Primary information was collected through interviews and field observations involving community actors and individuals associated with program implementation. The interviews focused on participants' experiences, changes in their activities, relationships with other community groups, access to productive resources, and their roles in the development of the program. Field observations were conducted to understand how activities were implemented in practice, including interactions among community members, the use of productive facilities, the utilization of waste materials, and connections between economic and environmental activities. Secondary data consisted of program documents, activity records, training materials, community group documentation, production-related records, photographs, legal and institutional documents, and other relevant materials documenting the development of the Eco Superstar Program. These sources were used to reconstruct the development of the program and to complement information obtained from interviews and observations.

The analysis was conducted iteratively by organizing the collected information according to the development of the program and identifying recurring patterns related to community relationships, resource utilization, participation, capacity development, and institutional support. Particular attention was given to connections between activities—for example, when materials generated by one activity could be utilized by another, when previously separate community groups began to collaborate, or when community members gradually assumed responsibilities that had initially been supported by the company. These processes were interpreted as important elements in understanding social innovation and community agency within the program. The analysis was therefore not limited to identifying individual program outputs, but examined how relationships and practices changed as the program developed.

The interpretation was guided by three interconnected analytical perspectives derived from the literature: CSR as an enabling mechanism, social innovation as a process of changing relationships and practices, and circular economy as a process of resource

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

circulation and local value creation. These concepts were used as analytical lenses rather than as fixed variables, allowing the analysis to remain attentive to processes emerging from the case. The study particularly examined the transition from fragmented community activities toward greater integration, the role of CSR in facilitating connections among actors and resources, the participation of different community groups, the circulation and transformation of materials and knowledge, and the gradual development of community responsibility and agency. Quantitative information contained in program records was used selectively to illustrate relevant changes where appropriate, but numerical indicators were not treated as the primary basis for interpreting the case.

To strengthen the credibility of the findings, information from interviews, observations, and documentary sources was compared through data triangulation. Information concerning program activities and changes in community practices was examined across different sources and, where possible, across different stages of program implementation. This temporal perspective was important because the study understands social innovation as a gradual process rather than a single intervention or outcome. Differences between documentary records and participant experiences were considered as part of the interpretation and were not automatically resolved by prioritizing one source over another.

Overall, the methodological approach allowed the study to examine Eco Superstar as an evolving community system rather than simply as a collection of CSR activities. The analysis followed the relationship between CSR support, the connection of community actors, resource circulation, shared value creation, participation, and community agency. Through this approach, the study sought to explain how CSR can create enabling conditions for circular practices and social innovation to become embedded in everyday community activities within an urban context.

IV. RESULTS

A. From Fragmented Activities to an Integrated Urban Ecosystem

The development of Eco Superstar shows a gradual shift from separate community activities toward a more interconnected local system. Before the program, community groups were already involved in productive and social activities, but these activities largely operated independently. Small food and beverage businesses were managed individually, waste was generally treated as household waste, and the available public space had not yet been fully utilized as a productive community asset. The groups therefore had resources and capabilities, but these resources were not yet connected in a way that could generate value across activities.

The program did not immediately establish a fully integrated circular system. The process developed progressively. The initial stage focused on strengthening the capacity of the Sunterpreneur group through food hygiene, sanitation, and basic production skills. This was followed by the development of shared production facilities, equipment, and business legalities. These interventions gradually provided the organizational and physical foundation for cooperation beyond individual businesses.

A more significant change occurred when the program began connecting activities that had previously been treated as separate. Food production generated organic waste, particularly eggshells, which could be collected and processed by the Lansia Nirmala group. The resulting organic fertilizer and planting media were then used by the Pulo Jaya group for urban farming at an RPTRA. The harvested purple sweet potatoes could subsequently be used as raw materials for food products developed by Sunterpreneur. At the same time, paper waste was processed by Bank Sampah Kosambi into eco-paper bags that could return to the food-processing activities as product packaging.

These relationships changed the character of the program. The groups were no longer connected only because they participated in the same CSR initiative; they became functionally connected because the output of one activity could become an input for another. The resulting system can therefore be understood as an emerging urban ecosystem in which materials, products, knowledge, and productive functions move between community actors. The findings indicate that the integration itself, rather than any individual intervention, became one of the central features of the social innovation.

B. CSR as an Enabler of Circular Value Creation

The findings indicate that the role of CSR in Eco Superstar extended beyond the provision of equipment or financial support. Corporate support helped create the conditions under which community actors could develop shared facilities, improve production practices, obtain business legalities, access productive spaces, and establish relationships with other groups. In this sense, CSR functioned as an enabling structure that supported connections between resources that were previously underutilized or disconnected.

This enabling role became particularly visible in the transition from linear to circular resource use. Before the program, eggshells generated from food production were disposed of together with domestic waste. Through the program, the material was separated and redirected to another community group for processing into organic fertilizer and planting media. Similarly, paper waste was not treated only as material to be discarded but was transformed into packaging that could be used again within the local production system.

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

The circular relationships were also supported by the development of productive assets. The shared production house provided a physical basis for food-processing activities, while the RPTRA became a productive space for urban farming and environmental learning. The importance of these assets was therefore not limited to their physical function. They became spaces where community members could meet, organize activities, exchange knowledge, and maintain relationships between different parts of the emerging system.

The findings suggest that CSR created value not simply by adding new resources to the community, but by helping existing resources acquire new functions. Waste became a production input, public space became a productive asset, and community knowledge became part of a wider value network. This illustrates how CSR can enable circular value creation through the reorganization of existing local resources rather than relying entirely on external inputs.

C. Community Inclusion Through Differentiated Roles

Another important finding concerns the way participation was organized. Eco Superstar did not involve community members through a single standardized role. Instead, different groups participated according to their existing capacities, circumstances, and available resources. Women involved in household-based businesses were supported to strengthen production and market access, while elderly community members participated in organic waste processing. The Pulo Jaya group utilized available public land for urban farming, and children participated through environmental learning activities.

This differentiated participation is important because inclusion in the program was not simply determined by the number of beneficiaries. It was reflected in the creation of meaningful roles within the system. Each group contributed something different, while also receiving resources or outputs from other participants. The elderly group, for example, gained a productive role through the processing of eggshell waste, while the urban farming group gained access to organic fertilizer and productive space.

The connections between these groups also created what can be described as functional social cohesion. Community members collaborated not only because they lived in the same neighbourhood, but because their activities had become related. The exchange of materials, products, knowledge, and markets created practical reasons for continued interaction.

An important indication of this change was the emergence of community contributions beyond the original program activities. The groups began participating in collective maintenance, meetings, joint production, and social activities. The documentation also records a contribution from the community groups to a local initiative addressing child nutrition. This suggests that participation gradually expanded from receiving program support toward contributing resources and benefits to the wider community.

D. Resource Circulation and Local Value Addition

The circularity developed through Eco Superstar was closely connected with local economic activities. Rather than treating waste management and income generation as separate objectives, the program linked them through material flows. The eggshell cycle provides one example: food-processing activities generated eggshell waste, the waste was processed into an agricultural input, the input supported urban farming, and the resulting crop returned to food production as a locally sourced ingredient.

A similar relationship emerged through paper waste. Bank Sampah Kosambi processed paper into eco-paper bags, which were then used by Sunterpreneur for product packaging. This created a direct connection between waste recovery and the market-facing side of community production. The value of the recovered material therefore did not end with waste collection; it was extended through processing and subsequent use in another local activity.

Urban farming also gained a new role within the system. The RPTRA was transformed from an underutilized public space into an area that supported production and learning. The purple sweet potato produced there became connected to food processing, creating a local supply relationship rather than a stand-alone agricultural activity. The available evidence indicates that this connection generated additional economic value and reduced part of the group's dependence on externally sourced raw materials.

These findings show that circularity in the case was created through relatively simple materials and activities. Its significance lies in the relationships established around them. The program connected waste, agricultural inputs, food ingredients, packaging, production, and markets into a sequence of activities in which value could be retained locally for longer.

E. From Beneficiaries to Community Actors

The development of community agency emerged alongside improvements in organizational capacity. Training covered not only technical production but also food safety, financial recording, marketing, waste processing, packaging, and urban farming. This broader capacity development allowed community members to take on roles that were previously unavailable to them.

Organizational arrangements also changed. Sunterpreneur, for example, developed from a structure that was heavily centered on one leader toward a more distributed division of responsibilities covering administration, finance, production, procurement, and logistics. This redistribution reduced the concentration of responsibility and created greater opportunities for members to participate in organizational tasks.

Business legalities and standardization further strengthened the position of the community groups. The acquisition of P-IRT, NIB, halal certification, trademarks, and intellectual property documentation provided forms of institutional capital that could

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

remain with the groups beyond individual CSR activities. These assets supported product credibility and created opportunities to engage with more formal markets.

The findings therefore point to a broader form of empowerment. Community agency was not represented only by increased income or the ability to produce goods. It was also reflected in the growing ability of community members to organize activities, manage assets, make decisions, establish relationships with other groups, and contribute to activities outside the immediate scope of the CSR intervention. In this sense, the program gradually shifted the position of community members from beneficiaries toward actors who participate in maintaining and extending the system.

F. Learning, Institutionalization, and the Conditions for Continuity

Learning emerged as an important mechanism connecting different stages of the program. Knowledge was introduced through training and subsequently embedded in community activities and learning materials. The program also developed an inclusive MSME learning module, while the urban farming and environmental activities created opportunities for knowledge to be shared across generations.

Institutionalization was also visible through the combination of organizational structures, legalities, productive assets, and relationships with external stakeholders. The shared production house, RPTRA, community groups, and business legalities created resources that were not dependent solely on a single training session or short-term activity. Government support also contributed legitimacy to community institutions and the use of public assets.

At the same time, the emerging system was not without vulnerabilities. The strong position of Sunterpreneur as a central production actor means that a decline in its production could affect the availability of eggshells, demand for eco-packaging, and demand for locally produced agricultural inputs. The program documentation identifies stronger marketing and production capacity as mechanisms for reducing this dependency.

The program also incorporated a gradual reduction of corporate support through a phase-down and phase-over strategy. Financial and mentoring support were planned to decrease progressively, while management responsibilities were transferred toward the community groups. This approach indicates that continuity was considered not simply as the continuation of CSR assistance, but as the ability of community actors and institutions to maintain the relationships and activities developed through the program.

Overall, the results show that the central change associated with Eco Superstar was the emergence of connections among community actors, resources, and activities that had previously functioned separately. CSR support helped establish the infrastructure and capabilities for these connections, while community actors increasingly maintained and developed them. Circularity consequently emerged not only through the recovery of materials, but through the circulation of roles, knowledge, products, and value among community groups. This combination of resource circulation, differentiated participation, and growing community agency represents the main social innovation identified in the case.

V. DISCUSSION

A. CSR Beyond Philanthropic Intervention

The findings suggest that the role of CSR in Eco Superstar is better understood as an enabling process than as a conventional philanthropic intervention. The program did provide tangible support in the form of equipment, production facilities, training, legal assistance, and access to productive spaces. However, these inputs alone do not explain the development of the system observed in the case. What became more important was the way these resources were used to connect community groups that previously operated separately.

This finding supports the broader understanding of CSR as a means of creating shared value between business and society (Porter & Kramer, 2011). In the Eco Superstar case, the social value did not emerge independently from the economic and environmental activities. Instead, the three dimensions became connected through relationships among community actors. Support for food-processing businesses, for example, created a material stream in the form of eggshell waste. That material subsequently became relevant to another group through organic fertilizer production, which then supported urban farming activities. CSR therefore functioned as a facilitator of relationships rather than merely as a mechanism for transferring resources.

This distinction is important for understanding CSR-based community programs. A program may provide similar forms of assistance to several groups without necessarily producing an integrated system. In Eco Superstar, the more significant change occurred when assistance was accompanied by connections between groups, assets, and activities. The company's role was consequently not limited to being a provider of resources. It also helped create an environment in which existing community capacities could interact and generate new forms of value.

From a social innovation perspective, this is significant because innovation can emerge through changes in social relations and practices rather than through technological novelty alone (Howaldt & Schwarz, 2017). The case indicates that the innovative element of Eco Superstar lies partly in the reorganization of existing resources and relationships. The program did not need to introduce an

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

entirely new technology to create a different way of addressing urban social and environmental problems. Instead, it created connections among activities that had previously been treated as separate.

B. Circular Economy as a Social Process

The findings also indicate that circular economy practices in an urban community cannot be fully understood through material flows alone. The circulation of eggshells, paper, agricultural products, and other resources depended on relationships between people and groups. Without actors willing and able to collect, process, exchange, and use these materials, the circular system would not function.

This observation extends the conventional interpretation of circular economy, which often emphasizes resource efficiency, waste reduction, reuse, and material recovery. In Eco Superstar, material circulation was closely linked to social organization. The eggshell cycle, for example, required cooperation between food producers and the elderly group responsible for processing the material. The resulting fertilizer then became useful because another community group had access to land and the capacity to conduct urban farming. The harvested crop could subsequently return to the food-processing group as a raw material. Circularity therefore emerged from a sequence of social and economic relationships surrounding the material.

This finding is consistent with research emphasizing the social dimension of circular economy and the importance of community participation in developing circular practices. In the Indonesian context, community-based circularity is increasingly associated not only with environmental management but also with livelihoods, social relationships, and empowerment. The Eco Superstar case adds to this discussion by showing that resource circulation can simultaneously create roles for groups with different capacities.

The case also demonstrates that circularity does not necessarily require a large-scale industrial system. It can develop at a community scale through relatively simple connections between production, waste management, agriculture, and consumption. What matters is the existence of a relationship in which the output of one activity can become useful to another. This suggests that community-level circular economy initiatives may be particularly relevant in dense urban areas where land and material resources are limited but social networks and consumption-based economic activities are relatively concentrated.

C. Reconfiguring Community Assets into Shared Value

One of the more important findings is that the program did not rely entirely on creating new assets. Several existing resources acquired new functions through the program. The RPTRA, for example, had previously not been fully utilized as a productive community asset. Through the program, it became a space for urban farming as well as environmental learning. Likewise, waste materials that had previously been regarded as disposable became inputs for productive activities.

This process can be understood as a form of resource reconfiguration. A resource does not necessarily become valuable because its physical characteristics change; its value can also change when it is placed within a different relationship. An eggshell discarded as domestic waste has limited immediate value to the food producer. Once connected with the knowledge and activities of the Lansia Nirmala group, however, it becomes an agricultural input. Similarly, paper waste acquires another function when it is processed into packaging used by local businesses.

The findings therefore suggest that social innovation can involve recognizing and reorganizing overlooked resources within a community. This perspective is particularly relevant to urban settings, where conventional productive resources such as land may be scarce. Instead of treating limited space and waste generation only as constraints, the program created opportunities to reinterpret existing assets as part of a local value system.

The transformation of assets also contributed to shared value creation. Economic value was generated through products and productive activities, while environmental value emerged through resource recovery and reduced waste disposal. At the same time, social value developed through new roles, knowledge exchange, and participation. These forms of value were not produced independently. They were connected through the same set of community relationships.

D. From Beneficiaries to Community Actors

Another important implication concerns the changing position of community members. Conventional CSR programs may create a relatively clear distinction between the company as the provider and the community as the beneficiary. The Eco Superstar case shows a gradual movement away from this arrangement.

The shift was not immediate. During the earlier stages, community members relied more heavily on training, equipment, facilities, and facilitation provided through the program. Over time, however, community groups developed greater responsibility for production, waste processing, asset management, organizational functions, and relationships with other groups. The development of shared responsibilities within Sunterpreneur and the emergence of cooperation between different groups illustrate this gradual change.

This finding is consistent with the empowerment perspective, in which participation involves more than receiving benefits and includes the capacity to influence decisions, manage resources, and act collectively. The important point is that agency in this case

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

was developed through practice. Community members learned by participating in production, managing facilities, processing materials, interacting with markets, and maintaining relationships with other groups.

The change can therefore be understood as a movement from program participation toward system participation. In the first condition, a community member participates in an activity supported by CSR. In the second, the community member becomes part of a wider system whose functioning depends on their contribution. This distinction is important because the latter creates a stronger basis for community ownership. When an activity is connected to other activities, maintaining it becomes relevant not only to the individual group but also to other actors within the system.

However, the findings also indicate that community agency does not mean complete independence from external support. The program still requires market access, institutional support, and relationships with external stakeholders. Community ownership should therefore be understood as increasing capacity to manage and develop the system, rather than as complete separation from the company or other institutions.

E. Cultural and Institutional Context of Urban Social Innovation

The Eco Superstar case also demonstrates that social innovation is shaped by its local institutional and social context. The emerging system was not created in an institutional vacuum. It developed through existing community organizations, public spaces, local government relationships, business activities, and social practices.

The role of collective practices is particularly relevant. Activities such as joint production, meetings, shared maintenance, and cooperation between groups created repeated opportunities for interaction. These practices helped transform relationships from occasional contact into more functional forms of cooperation. In this sense, social innovation was embedded in everyday community organization rather than being introduced as an external model.

Institutionalization also played an important role. Business legalities, organizational structures, shared facilities, learning materials, and public-space utilization provided a more stable foundation for the activities. These elements helped translate program activities into arrangements that could potentially continue beyond individual interventions. The phase-down and phase-over approach further reflected an effort to gradually transfer responsibility toward community groups.

At the same time, the case shows that integration can create new forms of dependency. Because several activities are connected, a disruption in one central activity may affect other actors. The strong role of Sunterpreneur within the local production system illustrates this potential vulnerability. A decline in food production could influence the availability of eggshell waste, demand for eco-packaging, and the demand for agricultural products. Thus, integration can strengthen a circular system while simultaneously creating interdependence that needs to be managed.

This finding is important because sustainability should not be equated simply with the existence of connections. A connected system also needs sufficient diversity, capacity, and market relationships to absorb changes. Strengthening alternative markets and broadening relationships can therefore be as important as strengthening individual community groups.

F. Implications for CSR Practice and Research

The Eco Superstar case offers several implications for CSR practice. First, CSR programs that aim to support social innovation may benefit from beginning with a mapping of existing community actors, assets, material flows, and relationships rather than designing activities around isolated beneficiary groups. Such mapping can reveal opportunities for connections that may not be visible when social, economic, and environmental problems are addressed separately.

Second, the findings suggest that CSR interventions can be designed around connections rather than only activities. Training, equipment, legal assistance, productive spaces, and market access become more meaningful when they contribute to relationships between community actors. This requires companies to consider not only what support each group needs, but also what one group can provide to another.

Third, circular economy initiatives should incorporate social participation into their design. Waste recovery becomes more meaningful when community members can obtain productive roles from the process. In the Eco Superstar case, circularity provided opportunities for different groups to participate according to their capacities, creating a relationship between environmental improvement and social inclusion.

Finally, the case suggests that evaluation of CSR-based social innovation should not rely exclusively on output indicators. Income, production, waste utilization, and beneficiary numbers remain useful evidence, but they do not fully explain how a community system develops. Additional attention should be given to changes in relationships, resource exchanges, decision-making, role distribution, and community responsibility. Such dimensions can help explain why some CSR interventions become embedded in community practices while others remain dependent on external support.

For future research, the Eco Superstar case points to the need for comparative studies of community-based circular social innovation across different urban settings. Comparative research could examine whether similar enabling mechanisms emerge in communities with different institutional structures, economic activities, resource constraints, and levels of corporate involvement.

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

Further research could also examine the long-term evolution of community agency after corporate support is reduced, particularly in relation to market independence, institutional resilience, and the diversification of community-to-community relationships.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study examined the Eco Superstar Program implemented by PT Pertamina Patra Niaga Integrated Terminal Jakarta as an example of how Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can enable urban circular social innovation. Rather than viewing the program primarily as a collection of community development activities, this study focused on the processes through which CSR connected previously separate community actors, resources, and activities within an urban setting.

The findings indicate that the main social innovation of Eco Superstar lies in the reconfiguration of existing community resources and relationships. Food-processing activities, organic waste, urban farming, recycling, environmentally responsible packaging, and environmental education were gradually connected through exchanges of materials, knowledge, products, and opportunities. In this process, materials that were previously considered waste acquired new functions, while community spaces, local knowledge, and existing social groups became productive resources within a broader circular system. The circularity created by the program therefore extends beyond material recovery and includes the circulation of social and economic value among community actors.

The study also highlights the enabling role of CSR. Corporate support provided resources, capacity building, infrastructure, facilitation, and opportunities for collaboration, but the development of the circular system depended on how these resources were embedded within existing community relationships. This suggests that the contribution of CSR to social innovation is not limited to the provision of financial or physical resources. CSR can also function as an enabling platform that facilitates connections, reduces fragmentation, strengthens local capabilities, and creates conditions for communities to participate in shaping their own development processes.

Another important finding concerns community agency. The Eco Superstar Program created differentiated roles for women, older residents, low-income groups, and children, allowing participation according to their existing capacities and social positions. Over time, participation moved beyond receiving assistance toward involvement in production, resource management, organizational activities, environmental practices, and local exchange. This transition can be understood as a movement from program participation to system participation, in which community members become actors within the functioning of the broader local ecosystem.

However, the case also demonstrates that interconnectedness can create new forms of interdependence. Because several resource and value flows are connected to particular community actors, changes in one activity may affect other parts of the system. Consequently, the continuity of urban circular social innovation requires more than maintaining individual activities. It requires strengthening organizational capacity, diversifying relationships, maintaining market access, and gradually increasing community responsibility for managing and developing the system.

Overall, the Eco Superstar case suggests that CSR can contribute to urban sustainability when it moves beyond fragmented interventions and facilitates the formation of relationships among community actors, resources, and local opportunities. The study contributes to the discussion of CSR, social innovation, and circular economy by showing how circularity can emerge as a community-based social process, particularly when corporate intervention is used to enable local connections rather than solely deliver predetermined outputs. This perspective provides an alternative way of understanding CSR in urban communities: not simply as assistance provided to beneficiaries, but as an enabling mechanism through which communities can reorganize existing resources, build collaborative relationships, and generate shared social, economic, and environmental value.

REFERENCES

- 1) Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- 2) Bocken, N. M. P., de Pauw, I., Bakker, C., & van der Grinten, B. (2016). Product design and business model strategies for a circular economy. *Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering*, 33(5), 308–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21681015.2016.1172124>
- 3) Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- 4) Devi, A. S., & Kumalasari, A. (2024). Corporate social responsibility program: Based on community development in the village. *Journal of Community Service and Empowerment*, 5(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jcse.v5i1.31445>
- 5) Dmytriiev, S. D., Freeman, R. E., & Hörisch, J. (2021). The relationship between stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility: Differences, similarities, and implications for social issues in management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(6), 1441–1470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12684>
- 6) Geissdoerfer, M., Savaget, P., Bocken, N. M. P., & Hultink, E. J. (2017). The circular economy: A new sustainability paradigm? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 143, 757–768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.048>

Corporate Social Responsibility as an Enabler of Urban Circular Social Innovation: The Eco Superstar Program in Jakarta, Indonesia

- 7) Howaldt, J., & Schwarz, M. (2010). *Social innovation: Concepts, research fields and international trends*. Sozialforschungsstelle, Technische Universität Dortmund.
- 8) Howaldt, J., & Schwarz, M. (2017). Social innovation and its relationship to social change. In J. Howaldt, C. Kaletka, A. Schröder, & M. Zirngiebl (Eds.), *Atlas of social innovation: New practices for a better future* (pp. 54–63). Sozialforschungsstelle, Technische Universität Dortmund.
- 9) Kirchherr, J., Reike, D., & Hekkert, M. (2017). Conceptualizing the circular economy: An analysis of 114 definitions. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 127, 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.09.005>
- 10) Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2018). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- 11) Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation*. NESTA & The Young Foundation.
- 12) Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- 13) Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1–2), 62–77.
- 14) Saefullah, K. S., Griesse, K.-M., & Chakraborty, A. (2026). The impact of circular economy and community development on human wellbeing in informal settlement areas in Indonesia: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 8, 1754215. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsc.2026.1754215>
- 15) Widhagdha, M. F., Santosa, F. J., Wardani, R. R. I. K., Retnaningsih, T. A., & Kartono, D. T. (2022). Community development model by corporate social responsibility in Indonesia: A systematic literature review. *Asean Social Work Journal*, 10(2), 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.58671/aswj.v10i2.17>
- 16) Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.