

Entrepreneurship and Rural Tourism: From Resource Constraints to Sustainable Livelihoods

*Mostafa Amirzadeh Vajargah¹, Mehdi Farzpourmachiani², Mehrdad Fojlaley³,
Snjezana Baroness Rajacic⁴*

¹*PhD. in Entrepreneurship, Technofest Institute of Technology University (TITU), Erquelinnes, Belgium*

²*Academician of the European Academy of Sciences, Assistant Professor in entrepreneurship, department of entrepreneurship, Technofest Institute of Technology University (TITU). Erquelinnes, Belgium*

³*Academician of the European Academy of Sciences, Professor in entrepreneurship, department of entrepreneurship, Technofest Institute of Technology University (TITU). Erquelinnes, Belgium*

⁴*Academician & President of the European Academy of Sciences, Professor in entrepreneurship, department of entrepreneurship, Technofest Institute of Technology University (TITU). Erquelinnes, Belgium*

Received 20/08/2024

Accepted 01/09/2024

Abstract

Most entrepreneurship studies have an urban focus and are mainly studied from the perspective of exploiting opportunities. Rural entrepreneurship presents different characteristics, and needs to be analyzed from a resource-based perspective, because this type of entrepreneurial behavior occurs in rural communities under resource constraints. The perspective of sustainable livelihoods shows the relevant framework in rural entrepreneurship considering the resources and capacities to face poverty in rural areas. Therefore, this study provides a literature review to identify current and emerging issues in rural entrepreneurship from a sustainable livelihood framework. Literature review shows that the main concepts involved in rural entrepreneurship and women's sustainable livelihood are poverty alleviation, youth, social entrepreneurship and institutions. Likewise, social capital and human capital are analyzed as the most relevant capitals in the documents. This study offers research opportunities in emerging topics related to social entrepreneurship, governance and institutions, livelihood development and environmental entrepreneurship to expand the boundaries of rural entrepreneurship from a sustainable livelihood framework.

Keywords: rural entrepreneurship; sustainable livelihood; social entrepreneurship; women; poverty alleviation; youth; Social capital

In the past years, the entrepreneurship literature has mainly focused on entrepreneurship in urban areas (Pato and Teixeira, 2016). Analyzes in this area focus on the characteristics of entrepreneurs and examine the ways in which different actors discover, implement, evaluate and exploit opportunities to create new businesses (Tabares et al., 2021). These methods provide models and solutions for value creation, including financial, social and environmental values (Tabares et al., 2021). However, the entrepreneurship literature has largely ignored entrepreneurial activities in rural areas, especially in developing countries, and theoretical and empirical studies in this area are still limited (Pato & Teixeira, 2016).

Rural entrepreneurship plays an essential role in reducing extreme poverty (Sutter et al., 2019) and inequality in rural areas with weak institutions (Diaz et al., 2019; Bava et al., 2007). Moreover, it helps to create an inclusive and sustainable future, especially in emerging economies (Misa, 2021; Mishra et al., 2020). In summary, rural entrepreneurship has the potential for rural entrepreneurs/companies to create value for society and create more resilient places (Pato & Teixeira, 2016).

Thus, entrepreneurship provides self-employment opportunities to enrich and improve the lifestyle of communities and lead them to a sustainable livelihood level (Agarwal et al., 2019). Likewise, it facilitates rural economic development, particularly for the livelihoods of rural women in developing countries (Akinbami et al., 2019), promotes sustainable development while meeting bottom-of-the-pyramid needs (Molina-Maturano et al., 2020).

Rural entrepreneurship should be studied to gain insight into effective empirical boundaries to gain a deep understanding of pure “rural entrepreneurship” occurring in rural areas (Pato & Teixeira, 2016). Considering the specific rural contexts, rural entrepreneurship should be studied not only from an opportunity-based perspective, but also from a resource-based perspective (Tran and Guerrero, 2020).

According to Bawa et al. (2007), rural entrepreneurial activities are pursued for poverty reduction due to lack of resources in emerging economies. This explains why local governments provide physical and financial resources as well as training and technical assistance to help rural entrepreneurs succeed (Humphreys et al., 2020). Unique entrepreneurial activities, such as those that take place across long physical distances between production sites and markets, in the primary sector and under mutual social control (Baumgartner et al., 2013), represent potential contributions in this regard.

In the case of rural entrepreneurship, the sustainable livelihoods perspective provides a relevant framework for measuring rural poverty. This framework goes beyond traditional linear measures of rural poverty based on income and proposes a multidimensional measure that is supported by improved livelihoods of vulnerable individuals and communities in rural areas (Chambers and Conway, 1992). The multidimensional perspective of sustainable livelihoods is relevant because poverty manifests itself in different ways and is influenced by different factors, not just income (Serena et al., 2015). In general, the literature on rural entrepreneurship and sustainable livelihoods are aligned in two aspects: poverty reduction and its application in rural areas. Based on this, the framework of sustainable livelihood becomes an ideal perspective to study the phenomenon of rural entrepreneurship.

Therefore, this study contributes to the knowledge of entrepreneurship by providing research ways to expand the boundaries of rural entrepreneurship from the framework of sustainable livelihoods that includes a multi-dimensional, interactive and multi-level approach and can overcome a linear and discontinuous analysis. In addition, this study contributes to the scientific debate by proposing six multidimensional factors (capitals) to strengthen rural livelihoods and reduce poverty in rural areas.

Based on this, this research was conducted with the aim of identifying current issues in the field of rural entrepreneurship from the framework of sustainable livelihood. To achieve this goal, this study highlights the relationship of rural entrepreneurship with the framework of sustainable livelihoods and describes current and emerging issues in rural entrepreneurship from the framework of sustainable livelihoods. Section 2 introduces the approach of rural entrepreneurship from the framework of sustainable livelihood. Section 3 describes the methodology by reviewing documents in the Scopus database. Section 4 shows

the current and emerging issues of rural entrepreneurship from the framework of sustainable livelihood. Section 5 presents the main conclusions.

Rural tourism entrepreneurship from a sustainable livelihoods framework

Generally, entrepreneurship is associated with opportunity entrepreneurship (Cano & Tabarés, 2017). Conversely, rural entrepreneurship has been linked to necessity entrepreneurship due to the scarcity of resources in rural areas (Audretsch et al., 2022).

Precisely, the sustainable livelihoods framework provides a suitable framework for analyzing rural entrepreneurship from a resource-based perspective as it helps to study the resource needs arising from the availability or scarcity of capital (Jaramiro-Gutierrez et al., 2021; Tran & Guerrero, 2020). This implies the best use of available resources, diversification and livelihood-based income toward sustainable livelihoods (Igwe et al., 2020) and the development of rural tourism as a new source of sustainable livelihoods in rural areas.

According to Scoones (1998), this livelihood consists of five types of capital that are necessary to face poverty: financial, physical, human, social and natural.

Financial capital includes essential elements for the creation of micro-enterprises such as household assets, resources, such as money, savings, loans, and property (Kumar et al., 2019).

Physical capital includes the assets and resources of households and communities, as well as machinery and technology involved in the production of raw materials, processed products, and the management of companies (Robotieh, 2012).

Human capital refers to the skills acquired and knowledge gained" (Scoones, 1998).

In general, entrepreneurship is linked to opportunity-driven entrepreneurship (Cano & Tabarés, 2017). Conversely, rural entrepreneurship, due to the scarcity of resources in rural areas, is linked to necessity-driven entrepreneurship (Audretsch et al., 2022). Specifically, the sustainable livelihoods perspective offers a suitable framework for analyzing rural entrepreneurship from a resource-based perspective, as it helps to study the resource needs arising from the availability or scarcity of capital (Jaramillo-Gutiérrez et al., 2021; Tran & Guérou, 2020). This implies the optimal utilization of existing resources, diversification and income-generating livelihoods towards sustainable livelihoods (Igue et al., 2020), and the development of rural tourism as a new source of sustainable livelihoods in rural areas.

Various studies indicate that supporting rural enterprises is justifiable as it is a means to alleviate, reduce, or even eradicate rural poverty, a concept assessed from a multidimensional sustainable livelihoods perspective (Abisogba Oyiukonnel & Sierra, 2018; Hamburg & Brown, 2014; Nambiar, 2019).

According to Scoones (1998), this livelihood is composed of five types of capital that are essential for coping with poverty: financial, physical, human, social, and natural.

Financial capital encompasses the essential elements for establishing microenterprises, such as household assets, resources like cash, savings, loans, and property (Kumar et al., 2019)

Physical capital encompasses the assets and resources of households and communities, as well as the machinery and technology involved in the production of raw materials, processed products, and the management of companies (Rebouti, 2012). Human capital refers to the skills acquired and knowledge gained (Scoones, 1998). Social capital is linked to formal and informal networks that shape social cooperation (Appin et al., 2019).

In the context of rural tourism entrepreneurship, these five types of capital play a crucial role in the development and sustainability of such activities.

Financial capital is essential for investing in tourism infrastructure, such as accommodations, restaurants, and recreational facilities. Physical capital includes natural resources like landscapes, historical, and cultural attractions, as well as human resources with the necessary skills to provide tourism services to visitors. Human capital encompasses the knowledge and skills required to manage tourism businesses, deliver quality services to customers, and develop new tourism products and experiences. Social capital consists of networks of relationships among tourism entrepreneurs, local communities, and other stakeholders, which can be used to facilitate cooperation, knowledge exchange, and access to resources.

Rural tourism development can create new job opportunities, increase income for local communities, and promote the preservation of local culture and heritage. However, it is important that this development is done in a sustainable manner that does not harm the environment or local communities.

The sustainable livelihoods framework can guide efforts to develop sustainable rural tourism. By focusing on the five types of capital essential for sustainable livelihoods, we can ensure that rural tourism benefits local communities and the environment. Ultimately, natural capital refers to natural resources such as land, water, air, living organisms, and ecosystems (Cohen et al., 2019).

In addition to these types of capital, Chipfupa and Wale (2018) propose a sixth type of capital called psychological capital, which refers to entrepreneurs' ability to overcome difficult situations such as economic crises. This type of capital is linked to a resilient mindset consisting of attitudes or behaviors that lead to recovery from adversity. This mindset is fueled by cognitive aspects, among which the values, beliefs, norms, and assumptions of entrepreneurs are distinct.

For Cederholm Björklund (2020), contextual factors such as values, beliefs, and social norms, both formal and informal, influence the success of rural entrepreneurship.

Psychological capital is influenced by these contextual factors, which can have a positive or negative impact on entrepreneurs' cognition and, therefore, on how they deal with challenges arising from market uncertainty (Chipfupa and Wale 2018).

According to Andreo and Fernandez (2019), there is a need for a more comprehensive and interactive analysis of sustainable livelihoods. Consequently, a dynamic approach is required where all forms of capital can be considered at multiple levels (Bawa et al., 2007). One challenge is examining the relationship between socioeconomic and environmental variables and how rural entrepreneurship can be both financially and environmentally sustainable (Nandi and Aminul Islam, 2010). Long and Fink (2019) suggest that capital interactions can be established at multiple levels, and social capital is intertwined with both bonding and bridging capital. Bonding capital is tied to shared beliefs and value systems within a community or group of communities (Shaw, 2017) and is context-specific (Söderholm Björklund, 2020).

Bridging capital, on the other hand, is related to external conditions and is manifested in resources and information." "Therefore, bridging capital can be associated with factors with which there is horizontal or vertical integration. In other words, bridging capital relates to different social groups and the power of the state, particularly in rural, local, and national areas. This recent reciprocal relationship reveals the inherent risk of corruption, especially in emerging economies where government management of resources is urgent (Long and Fink, 2019; Lundeno and Cruz, 2019).

Consequently, the sustainable livelihoods approach becomes an ideal framework for studying rural enterprises as it incorporates a rural focus and poverty reduction. Therefore, a sustainable livelihoods framework should overcome a linear and fragmented analysis and adopt a multidimensional, interactive, and multi-level approach.

Methodology

Research Method, the research method employed in this study is descriptive library research.

Findings

The dominant concepts in this field are: entrepreneurship, sustainable development, livelihood, rural development, sustainability, sustainable livelihood, innovation, and social entrepreneurship. These concepts exhibit similar densities, indicating that they are studied or examined in comparable proportions. Two distinct clusters can be identified: the first is related to sustainable development, and the second is related to sustainability, which is slightly more dominant.

For some authors, the concepts of sustainable development and sustainability can be considered similar (Holden et al., 2018). However, sustainable development emphasizes development as a priority and represents an alternative development theory, while the concept of sustainability prioritizes the environment (Cano & Lundemo-Pinda, 2020; Lundemo-Pinda & Cano, 2022). Based on this logic, this study follows Shaker's conceptualization (Shaker, 2015), which suggests that sustainability is the goal and sustainable development is the process of achieving it. In this view, sustainability is the starting point and sustainable development is one of the ways to reach it.

Poverty reduction, the second related issue, can be achieved through a combined effort of government, society, and academia to create a sustainable system (Dixit & Sakonia, 2022), where rural entrepreneurship plays a significant role in reducing extreme poverty (Satter et al., 2019), and where social enterprises can increase access to economic resources, income opportunities, and beneficial products and services (Humberg and Braun, 2014).

Similarly, the occurrence of poverty can be reduced through innovation platforms for smallholder farmers (Brown et al., 2021), the participation of non-governmental organizations (Amoufa et al., 2021), and stimulating the endogenous capacity of rural households to create positive livelihood trajectories (Deng et al., 2020), and a combination of land system reforms and policy innovation to provide rural land consolidation (Wang et al., 2021). Similarly, considering variables that affect the sustainable development of rural livelihoods, such as a participatory approach, socio-cultural context, process sustainability, rural

infrastructure, access to public services, local institutions, convergence, targeting the poor, and governance is needed (Kumar et al., 2020)

Given that young people in developing countries are often exposed to entrepreneurial activities early in life, youth appear to be the third most relevant long-term topic, as they represent key actors in entrepreneurial ecosystems (Baskaran and Mehta, 2016). Rural youth represent a nation's future food security by being the natural successors to family farming businesses. However, rural youth are demonstrating a decline in agriculture (Igwe et al., 2020) and face risks of leaving agriculture due to lack of land access, income uncertainty, and reliance on chemical fertilizers (Ningrum, 2018).

Rural youth have the potential to make unique contributions to business development (de Guzman et al., 2020) and create opportunities for micro-entrepreneurship (Brown et al., 2021). Therefore, various efforts can provide stable and sustainable self-employment opportunities for unemployed rural youth (Chowdhury and Sarma, 2020) and create efficient, market-oriented jobs, thereby ensuring sustainable employment for rural youth (Dixit and Sakunia, 2022).

Young people (Chakravarty et al. 2021) About social entrepreneurship, it is dedicated to addressing people's unmet needs in key areas, such as health and education, and social entrepreneurs are motivated to provide sustainable solutions to neglected problems (the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, economic and social empowerment of rural women, including others) with the help of positive external factors (Misha 2021; Mishra et al. 2020). Social entrepreneurship addresses basic human needs that are not met by existing markets and institutions (Bhandari 2017) and is directly related to rural development to allocate resources in rural communities (Lang and Fink 2019). This issue is related to the issue of women because most social entrepreneurship studies study women's entrepreneurship (Poon et al. 2012; Shaw 2017) and women's empowerment (Kumari and Egoroze 2022).

Institutions are among the five most relevant long-term themes, revolving around regional organizations that foster sustainability and play a vital role in rural economies. These organizations require social and human capital for their development (Bamgartner et al., 2013; Bawa et al., 2007). Similarly, institutions influence rural entrepreneurs by shaping regulatory and social conditions. It is imperative to support social entrepreneurs to foster innovation in vulnerable regions (Lang and Fink, 2019). Regarding informal institutions, such as culture and social structures, these have a more significant impact on entrepreneurial motivation in rural contexts compared to urban ones (Escandón-Barbosa et al., 2019). "From this perspective, supporting the creation of market-oriented institutions is necessary to enhance rural resilience and build sustainable rural communities (Lee et al., 2019). "In the medium-term scenario, our results indicate that themes such as women, poverty reduction, and youth remain the most prevalent. Over the past five years, issues related to institutions and governance have gained more prominence, while the topic of participation has been shifted to secondary analysis. Regarding governance, this study shows that to overcome the structural barriers of rural entrepreneurship, governmental contexts must be considered (Fotouhi et al., 2020). Our analysis reveals that governance is also expressed through other topics related to political cooperation and citizen participation, as greater community involvement leads to increased participation and promotion of entrepreneurship (Joshy et al., 2019), which contributes to poverty reduction (Nambiyar, 2019). Similarly, corporate governance provides a foundation for comprehensive resource management practices to enhance business development in small enterprises (Dixit and Sakunia 2022; Nzama 2021).

Results indicate that other topics such as social entrepreneurship and migration rank as the third group of issues discussed in the medium term. Regarding migration, our analysis reveals that this is due to various factors, including inter- or intra-regional flows in search of more fertile lands and greener pastures (Oteng-Ababio et al. 2019). "Interestingly, our study reveals that the youth population is constantly seeking better opportunities, as they migrate to urban areas in search of jobs that offer higher incomes and a better quality of life (Ningrum 2018).

To analyze emerging themes within the context of rural entrepreneurship frameworks and sustainable livelihoods, we consider four interrelated topics from the previous section: social entrepreneurship, governance and institutions, livelihood growth, and environmental entrepreneurship. These themes provide research opportunities to expand the existing body of knowledge on rural entrepreneurship through the lens of sustainable livelihoods.

Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is a powerful current in rural entrepreneurship that creates an inclusive, safe, and sustainable future (Misha 2021). It encompasses various forms of entrepreneurship, such as women's entrepreneurship (Bandari 2017), women's empowerment (Kumari and Agoroze 2022), youth entrepreneurship (Anand and Jose 2002), and indigenous community entrepreneurship. In this regard, social entrepreneurship can offer poverty reduction strategies based on farmers' initiative and resilience (Adeyonu et al. 2022) and promote sustainable livelihood solutions through group-based organizations (Chowdhury et al. 2017). According to research, these types of entrepreneurial actions are taken to help the community in times of crisis and to overcome barriers to access education, which leads to fewer opportunities (Misha 2021; Shaw 2017). Given that education plays the most significant role in all types of employment options (Igwe et al. 2020), this type of entrepreneurship requires government support (Figueroa-Domecq et al. 2020), especially in the initial stages (Chipfupa and Wale 2018).

Since women's entrepreneurship was a relevant topic in the individual three-scenario analysis, future research on studying this topic may continue from a livelihood perspective, from the livelihood environment or livelihood accelerators (Deng et al. 2020). As a result, there will be a better understanding of lost resources, the context in which they operate, and the factors that strengthen the livelihoods of women and other marginalized groups in rural areas.

Studies should continue to analyze how insecurity affects rural business activities and offer solutions based on collective actions to address the adverse impacts on business development that can lead to violent conflicts (Escandón-Barbosa et al. 2019; Ekanem et al. 2021). Similarly, social entrepreneurship and governance should be considered simultaneously as governance in these rural areas requires the inclusion of formal and informal institutions that promote social entrepreneurship (Adinsall et al. 2016).

Governance and Institutions

The interconnection between governance and institutions relates to the interactions between the entrepreneur and the environment (Deng et al. 2020), the convergence of local institutions and a confining institutional environment (Kumar et al. 2020), and horizontal and vertical relationships (Lang et al. 2019). Subsequently, formal and informal institutions must be considered in the analysis (Escandón-Barbosa et

al. 2019), as well as government policies and interventions (Otoijamun et al. 2021). Similarly, there is a need for a better understanding of the rural context, specifically the value system and traditions of the entrepreneurs and the community that surrounds them (Söderholm Björklind 2020).

Most work in rural communities highlights the need for associations as a strategy for successful investments, whether as cooperatives (Sati and Juyal 2008; Zhu et al. 2015) or social associations (Mbaiwa 2004). Some studies in developing countries have shown that in many communities, individual work is preferred over collective work. This occurs for various reasons, such as distrust of institutions, distrust of third parties, and disapproval of economic models that ignore local realities (Tabares et al. 2021). There has been a call for a model of conscious capitalism and leadership (Misha et al. 2020) and the need to consider entrepreneurial actions based on territories (Joshi et al. 2019) and environmental conditions since these are exogenous factors that can either activate or inhibit successful entrepreneurship (Baskaran and Mehta 2016). Therefore, more research is needed to examine the context, institutions, and governance of rural entrepreneurship.

Livelihood Growth

Livelihood growth is linked to the criterion of livelihood acceleration, which considers the factors that contribute to a fundamental improvement in livelihoods (Deng et al. 2020). These factors can include technology and market linkages (Mahale et al. 2011). It is expected that this technology will be environmentally friendly (Samal et al. 2016) and play a significant role in the productivity of rural entrepreneurship (Mahesh et al. 2020) to leverage e-commerce opportunities. In this regard, even during the COVID-19 pandemic, an e-commerce marketplace like Amazon experienced historic growth in its sales (Keshtari 2020). In the case of rural enterprises, most entrepreneurial activities are in family businesses or micro-enterprises, which are usually characterized by an inability to respond quickly to economic and financial downturns (Robins and Pearce 1993). The challenge lies in transforming subsistence-oriented smallholder systems into sustainable, efficient, and market-oriented systems (Chakravarty et al. 2021), promoting formal agricultural employment or agricultural entrepreneurship (Wang et al. 2020), and improving productive capacity to reach broader markets (Ashby et al. 2009).

Therefore, further research on how e-markets contribute to increased sales will be an interesting direction (Hoyos-Estrada and Sastok-Gomez 2020), as well as the integration of frameworks, such as the technology acceptance model and rural sustainable livelihoods (Molina-Matarano et al. 2020). Similarly, future research can study how a country's institutions can be oriented towards markets (Lee et al. 2019), and how institutions can support rural investment schemes for local and international growth (Ashby et al. 2009). Since a large part of rural communities feel a fear of opening up to the unknown (De Guzman et al. 2020), an emerging line of research involves studying the internationalization of rural firms and expressing it with a governance and institutional perspective.

Eco-Entrepreneurship

Rural entrepreneurship recognizes the entrepreneur as an actor influenced by a series of socio-ecological conditions (Diaz et al., 2019). Subsequently, there is a need to identify key factors for the success or failure of these rural investments (Papzan et al. 2008; Pato and Tikkanen 2018). Given climate change, most women engaged in agriculture have a high awareness of climate changes in their area and know that climate change has had a significant impact on soil fertility, leading to less predictability and longer dry seasons (Akin Bami et al. 2019). Therefore, if crop productivity is expected to be longer in various rural areas globally, rural entrepreneurial productivity should be ecological (Samal et al., 2016), especially when traditional rural livelihoods are being eroded due to declining natural resources, climate pressures, and modernization (Kimbo et al. 2022).

One way to achieve sustainable rural livelihoods is through agritourism, rural tourism, and sustainable tourism, which require contemporary tourism affairs and tourism strategies to change the livelihoods of the local community, promote local sustainable development, and provide individual and social welfare (Ramaano 2021; Milan-Garcia et al.). Tourism can be a vehicle for community development and poverty reduction, promoting economic growth, and providing fair and equitable benefits to local communities to meet their household needs (Stone et al. 2021). Similarly, community forest enterprises can strengthen community development through the sustainable use of forest resources, facilitating the achievement of financial, social, and environmental goals in the forest sector (Ziegler and Kozák 2021).

Regarding the topic of eco-entrepreneurship, we propose more research into addressing the challenges faced by environmental entrepreneurs in introducing eco-innovations while simultaneously focusing on farmers' daily income and poverty reduction (Humphries et al. 2020; Palmas and Lindberg 2013)."

"Therefore, if rural entrepreneurship is expected to support sustainable development, the ecological dimension of entrepreneurship should not be overlooked. Research lines focusing on the preservation and regeneration of natural capital will be crucial for enriching the discourse, providing insights into long-term poverty reduction (Shahriyari and Heidari 2019) and the conservation of depleting or endangered natural resources.

Conclusions

Since the 1980s, the primary focus in entrepreneurship has been on how to exploit opportunities. However, due to limited resources for rural enterprises, entrepreneurship literature needs to adopt a resource-based view to understand how opportunities are discovered or created and how resources are acquired to exploit those opportunities. In this sense, the sustainable livelihoods framework, grounded in resources and coping capacities in rural areas, constitutes an ideal framework for addressing the phenomenon of rural entrepreneurship. Admittedly, this framework should move beyond a linear approach to a multi-dimensional, interactive, and multi-level approach.

A general mapping of rural entrepreneurship from the sustainable livelihoods framework enabled the identification of two nodes of sustainable development and sustainability, where the first node refers to the process and the second to the goal. Additionally, we reviewed the literature on rural entrepreneurship and sustainable livelihoods to identify current research topics. The analysis showed that the topic of

women has the most connections and is linked to various concepts such as women entrepreneurship, women empowerment, and women's employment, among others. The results allow us to identify that social entrepreneurship is the most relevant topic, which is related to solving basic human needs that are not met by existing markets and institutions in key areas such as health and education. This topic focuses on allocating resources in rural communities to provide sustainable solutions to neglected problems. Similarly, social capital is the most relevant capital, representing the foundation of social entrepreneurship and the connections that support social collaboration among women, youth, and institutions to achieve poverty reduction.

Emerging Themes from the Integrated Four Lines

Our study proposes future work in the field of social entrepreneurship related to women's entrepreneurship in rural areas, focusing on three perspectives: resource scarcity, context, and livelihood growth. Considering governance and institutions, our study suggests examining the limiting factors of cooperative and associative models in communities. With regard to livelihood growth, future research can explore how e-markets contribute to livelihood growth and the internationalization of rural enterprises. Finally, more research is needed on environmental entrepreneurship to provide environmental solutions and eco-innovations while ensuring poverty reduction.

Reference

1. Abisuga Oyekunle, Oluwayemisi Adebola, and Mziwoxolo Sirayi. 2018. The role of creative industries as a driver for a sustainable economy: A case of South Africa. *Creative Industries Journal* 11: 225–44. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
2. Addinsall, Cherise, Kevin Glencross, Norah Rihai, Leimon Kalomor, Grahame Palmer, Donald Nichols, and Geoff Smith. 2016. Enhancing agroforestry in Vanuatu: Striking the balance between individual entrepreneurship and community development. *Forests Trees and Livelihoods* 25: 78–96. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
3. Adeyonu, Abigail G., Olubunmi L. Balogun, Ifeoluwapo O. Amao, and Timothy O. Agboola. 2022. Does farmers' entrepreneurial competencies explain their household poverty status? Evidence from rural areas of Kwara State, Nigeria. *Cogent Economics and Finance* 10: 1–16. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
4. Aggarwal, Shalini, Anurag Pahuja, and Ruchi Sharma. 2019. Samriddhii: A Case of Integrated Social Entrepreneurship in Bihar. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management* 19: 22–36. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Akinbami, C. A. O., J. E. Olawoye, A. Adesina, and V. Nelson. 2019. Exploring potential climate-related entrepreneurship opportunities and challenges for rural Nigerian women. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research* 9: 1–28. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
6. Amofah, Seth, Lily Agyare, and Triin Roosalu. 2021. Social Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Livelihood Empowerment: Study of an Estonian NGO's Operations in Ghana. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social and Community Studies* 17: 1–18. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
7. Anand, Anita, and Ojaswi Josse. 2002. Celebrating mountain women: Moving mountains, moving women. *Mountain Research and Development* 22: 233–35. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

8. Andreu, Alberto, and Joaquín Fernández. 2019. Los ODS y sus (posibles) lagunas. El País. Available online: https://elpais.com/elpais/2019/02/08/planeta_futuro/1549628983_409880.html (accessed on 7 April 2022).
9. Apine, Elina, Lucy M. Turner, Lynda D. Rodwell, and Ramachandra Bhatta. 2019. The application of the sustainable livelihood approach to small scale-fisheries: The case of mud crab *Scylla serrata* in South west India. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 170: 17–28. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
10. Ashby, Jacqueline, Geoffrey Heinrich, Gaye Burpee, Thomas Remington, Kim Wilson, Carlos Arturo Quiros, Marco Aldana, and Shaun Ferris. 2009. What farmers want: Collective capacity for sustainable entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 7: 130–46. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
11. Audretsch, David B., Maksim Belitski, Farzana Chowdhury, and Sameeksha Desai. 2022. Necessity or opportunity? Government size, tax policy, corruption, and implications for entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics* 58: 2025–42. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
12. Baskaran, Shruthi, and Khanjan Mehta. 2016. What is innovation anyway? Youth perspectives from resource-constrained environments. *Technovation* 52–53: 4–17. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
13. Baumgartner, Daniel, Marco Pütz, and Irmi Seidl. 2013. What Kind of Entrepreneurship Drives Regional Development in European Non-core Regions? A Literature Review on Empirical Entrepreneurship Research. *European Planning Studies* 21: 1095–127. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
14. Bawa, Kamaljit S., Gladwin Joseph, and Siddappa Setty. 2007. Poverty, biodiversity and institutions in forest-agriculture ecotones in the Western Ghats and Eastern Himalaya ranges of India. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 121: 287–95. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
15. Bhandari, Vandana. 2017. New directions for social enterprises: The role of design in empowerment. *Scope: (Art and Design)* 15: 24–28. [[Google Scholar](#)]
16. Bradley, Tamsin, Avijit Chakravarti, and Jane Rowan. 2013. What Happened When the Corporates Met the Artists of Rural West Bengal? A Critical Analysis into Art as Social Enterprise in India. *Journal of South Asian Development* 8: 85–104. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Brown, Peter, Mazhar Anwar, Shakhawat Hossain, Rashadul Islam, Nur-E.-Alam Siddique, Mamunur Rashid, Ram Datt, Ranvir Kumar, Sanjay Kumar, Kausik Pradhan, and et al. 2021. Application of innovation platforms to catalyse adoption of conservation agriculture practices in South Asia. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 10: 1–24. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Cahn, Miranda. 2008. Indigenous entrepreneurship, culture and micro-enterprise in the Pacific Islands: Case studies from Samoa. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 20: 1–18. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Cano, Jose Alejandro, and Abraham Londoño-Pineda. 2020. Scientific Literature Analysis on Sustainability with the Implication of Open Innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity* 6: 162. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Cano, Jose Alejandro, and Alexander Tabares. 2017. Determinants of university students' entrepreneurial intention: GUESSS Colombia study. *Espacios* 38: 22. [[Google Scholar](#)]

21. Cederholm Björklund, Jennie. 2020. *Value Creation for Sustainable Rural Development Perspectives of Entrepreneurship in Agriculture*. (Issue 68). Halmstad: Halmstad University. [[Google Scholar](#)]
22. Chakravarty, Amit, Anthony Whitbread, Pooran Gaur, Aravazhi Selvaraj, Saikat Datta Mazumdar, Jonathan Philroy, Priyanka Durgalla, Harshvardhan Mane, and Kiran Sharma. 2021. Benefitting Smallholder Farmers in Africa: Role of ICRISAT. In *India–Africa Partnerships for Food Security and Capacity Building. International Political Economy Series*. Edited by Renu Modi and Meera Venkatachalam. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 73–93. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
23. Chambers, Robert, and Gordon R. Conway. 1992. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. IDS Discussion Paper 296. Available online: <https://www.ids.ac.uk/publications/sustainable-rural-livelihoods-practical-concepts-for-the-21st-century/> (accessed on 7 April 2022).
24. Chidanand, Fabien, L. M. Frey, and Gyanendra Singh. 2021. Village development framework through self-help-group entrepreneurship, microcredit, and anchor customers in solar microgrids for cooperative sustainable rural societies. *Journal of Rural Studies* 88: 432–40. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
25. Chipfupa, Unity, and Edilegnaw Wale. 2018. Farmer typology formulation accounting for psychological capital: Implications for on-farm entrepreneurial development. *Development in Practice* 28: 600–14. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Chirambo, Dumisani. 2019. The Roles of ICT and Social Innovation in Enhancing Forestry Governance and Forestry Entrepreneurship in Sub-Saharan Africa. In *Advances in Environmental Research*. Edited by J. A. Daniels. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc., vol. 68, pp. 103–29. [[Google Scholar](#)]
27. Choudhury, Smritishikha, and Nripendra Narayan Sarma. 2020. Value Chain Interventions Imperatives for Livelihood Development. *Pacific Business Review International* 13: 121–26. [[Google Scholar](#)]
28. Chowdhury, Abhiroop, Alliya Naz, and Subodh Kumar Maiti. 2017. Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Health risk assessment of ‘tiger prawn seed’ collectors exposed to heavy metal pollution in the conserved mangrove forest of Indian Sundarbans: A socio-environmental perspective. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment* 23: 203–24. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Cohen, François, Cameron J. Hepburn, and Alexander Teytelboym. 2019. Is Natural Capital Really Substitutable? *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 44: 425–48. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
30. de Guzman, Maria Rosario T., Surin Kim, Sarah Taylor, and Irene Padasas. 2020. Rural communities as a context for entrepreneurship: Exploring perceptions of youth and business owners. *Journal of Rural Studies* 80: 45–52. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
31. Debnath, Ramit, and Ronita Bardhan. 2018. Resource Symbiosis Model through bricolage: A livelihood generation assessment of an Indian village. *Journal of Rural Studies* 60: 105–21. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Deka, Nabajyoti, Kishor Goswami, and Kumar Anurupam. 2021. What will drive the small tea growers towards environment-friendly cultivation? Implications from the tea sector in Assam, India. *Climate and Development* 10: 1–16. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Deng, Qingqing, Erling Li, and Pengyan Zhang. 2020. Livelihood sustainability and dynamic mechanisms of rural households out of poverty: An empirical analysis of Hua

- County, Henan Province, China. *Habitat International* 99: 102160. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Deng, Xiangzheng, and Xuemei Bai. 2014. Sustainable urbanization in Western China. *Environment* 56: 12–24. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 35. Díaz, David Gortaire, Migdalia Díaz Chong, and Enrique Diaz Chong. 2019. Effect of rural entrepreneurship and innovation adoption in the reduction of inequalities. *Journal of Science and Research* 4: 268–90. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 36. Dixit, Krishna, and Debashish Sakunia. 2022. Start-up Village Entrepreneurship Programme: 'From Local to Vocal'. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit* 10: 1–14. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 37. Ekanem, Ignatius, Terence Jackson, and Ayebaniminyo Munasuonyo. 2021. The Effect of Militancy on Local and Informal Enterprises in Developing Countries: Evidence from Niger Delta. *Journal of African Business* 22: 532–49. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 38. Ellis, Frank. 2000. *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [[Google Scholar](#)]
 39. Escandón- Barbosa, Diana Marcela, David Urbano, Andrea Hurtado-Ayala, Jairo Salas Paramo, and Alvaro Zapata Dominguez. 2019. Formal institutions, informal institutions and entrepreneurial activity: A comparative relationship between rural and urban areas in Colombia. *Journal of Urban Management* 8: 458–71. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 40. Falk, Thomas, Bernadette Bock, and Michael Kirk. 2009. Polycentrism and poverty: Experiences of rural water supply reform in Namibia. *Water Alternatives* 2: 115–37. [[Google Scholar](#)]
 41. Figueroa-Domecq, Cristina, Anna de Jong, and Allan Morgan Williams. 2020. Gender, tourism & entrepreneurship: A critical review. *Annals of Tourism Research* 84: 102980. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 42. Fudemma, Célia, Fabio De Castro, and Eduardo Brondizio. 2020. Farmers and Social Innovations in Rural Development: Collaborative Arrangements in Eastern Brazilian Amazon. *Land Use Policy* 99: 104999. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 43. Gangadhar, Bongurala. 2020. Involving Women in Farm Mechanisation for Improving Livelihoods of Farmers in Odisha. *Journal of Rural Development* 39: 96–109. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 44. Hetherington, Erin, Matthijs Eggers, Joyce Wamoyi, Jennifer Hatfield, Mange Manyama, Susan Kutz, and Sheri Bastien. 2017. Participatory science and innovation for improved sanitation and hygiene: Process and outcome evaluation of project SHINE, a school-based intervention in Rural Tanzania. *BMC Public Health* 17: 1–15. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)] [[Green Version](#)]
 45. Holden, Erling, Kristin Linnerud, David Banister, Valeria Schwanitz, and August Wierling. 2018. *The Imperatives of Sustainable Development: Needs, Justice, Limits*. London: Routledge. [[Google Scholar](#)]
 46. Hoyos-Estrada, Sherly, and Judith Daniela Sastoque-Gómez. 2020. Marketing Digital como oportunidad de digitalización de las PYMES en Colombia en tiempo del COVID-19. *Revista Científica Anfibios* 3: 39–46. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 47. Humberg, Krestin, and Boris Braun. 2014. Social Business and Poverty Alleviation: Lessons from Grameen Danone and Grameen Veolia. In *Social Business*. Edited by Andrea Grove and Gary Berg. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 201–23. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

48. Humphries, Shoana, Thomas Holmes, Dárlinson Fernandes Carvalho de Andrade, David McGrath, and Jeremias Batista Dantas. 2020. Searching for win-win forest outcomes: Learning-by-doing, financial viability, and income growth for a community-based forest management cooperative in the Brazilian Amazon. *World Development* 125: 104336. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
49. Huttunen, Suvi. 2012. Wood energy production, sustainable farming livelihood and multifunctionality in Finland. *Journal of Rural Studies* 28: 549–58. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Igwe, Paul Agu, Mahfuzur Rahman, Kenny Odunukan, and Nonso Ochinanwata. 2020. Drivers of diversification and pluriactivity among smallholder farmers evidence from Nigeria. *Green Finance* 2: 263–83. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Jaramillo-Gutierrez, Carlos Augusto, Abraham Allec Londoño-Pineda, and Óscar Alonso Vélez. 2021. Non-conventional anti-personnel landmines and sustainable livelihoods in Colombian rural areas. *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict* 14: 247–58. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Jokinen, Pekka, Marja Järvelä, Suvi Huttunen, and Antti Puupponen. 2008. Experiments in sustainable rural livelihood in Finland. *International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology* 7: 211–28. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Joshi, Lalita, Deepak Choudhary, Praveen Kumar, Jayendran Venkateswaran, and Chetan Solanki. 2019. Does involvement of local community ensure sustained energy access? A critical review of a solar PV technology intervention in rural India. *World Development* 122: 272–81. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Kabir, Shajahan, Mirjana Radovic-Markovic, Radmila Grozdanic, Rahima Akther, and Goran Kvgic. 2012. The impact of capital mix on rural women entrepreneurs: An evidence from Bangladesh. *Metalurgia International* 17: 211–23. [[Google Scholar](#)]
55. Kimbu, Albert Nsom, Irma Booyens, and Anke Winchenbach. 2022. Livelihood Diversification Through Tourism: Identity, Well-being, and Potential in Rural Coastal Communities. *Tourism Review International* 26: 25–40. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Kshetri, N. 2020. COVID-19 Meets Big Tech. *Computer* 53: 10–13. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Kumar, Harish, Bindhy Wasin Pandey, and Subhash Anand. 2019. Analyzing the Impacts of forest Ecosystem Services on Livelihood Security and Sustainability: A Case Study of Jim Corbett National Park in Uttarakhand. *International Journal of Geoheritage and Parks* 7: 45–55. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Kumar, Shubham, Tapas Kumar Giri, and Bidyut Jyoti Gogoi. 2020. Determinants of rural livelihood interventions: An ISM-MICMAC approach. *Journal of Indian Business Research* 12: 343–62. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Kumari, Gaitri, and Ebikinei Stanley Eguruze. 2022. Social Entrepreneurship Among Artisans. In *Artisan and Handicraft Entrepreneurs*. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 161–82. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Laeis, Gabriel, and Stefanie Lemke. 2016. Social entrepreneurship in tourism: Applying sustainable livelihoods approaches. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 28: 1076–93. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
61. Lang, Richard, and Matthias Fink. 2019. Rural social entrepreneurship: The role of social capital within and across institutional levels. *Journal of Rural Studies* 70: 155–68. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)] [[Green Version](#)]

62. Li, Yuheng, Hans Westlund, and Yansui Liu. 2019. Why some rural areas decline while some others not: An overview of rural evolution in the world. *Journal of Rural Studies* 68: 135–43. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Londoño, Abraham, and José Gabriel Cruz. 2019. Evaluation of sustainable development in the sub-regions of Antioquia (Colombia) using multi-criteria composite indices: A tool for prioritizing public investment at the subnational level. *Environmental Development* 32: 100442. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Londoño-Pineda, Abraham Allec, and Jose Alejandro Cano. 2022. Assessments under the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Environmental and Climate Technologies* 26: 166–81. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
65. Lusambili, Adelaide, Njeri Nyanja, Sophie Vusha Chabeda, Marleen Temmerman, Lucy Nyaga, Jerim Obure, and Anthony Ngugi. 2021. Community health volunteers challenges and preferred income generating activities for sustainability: A qualitative case study of rural Kilifi, Kenya. *BMC Health Services Research* 21: 642. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Mahale, Geeta, Rajashri Kotur, and Shameembanu Byadgi. 2011. Women empowerment Sustainable livelihood through income generating activities. *Textile Trends* 54: 39–42. [[Google Scholar](#)]
67. Mahesh, Vinyas, Venkata Ramana Rao, Kumar Kiran, and Shridar Condoor. 2020. Women Technology Parks: A novel solution for women entrepreneurship and empowerment through location specific technologies and waste material utilization. *IOP Conference Series Materials Science and Engineering* 872: 012018. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
68. Mbaiwa, Joseph Elizeri. 2004. The success and sustainability of community-based natural resource management in the okavango delta, botswana. *South African Geographical Journal* 86: 44–53. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
69. Milán-García, Juan, Juan Uribe-Toril, José Luis Ruiz-Real, and Jaime de Pablo Valenciano. 2019. Sustainable Local Development: An Overview of the State of Knowledge. *Resources* 8: 31. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)] [[Green Version](#)]
70. Mishra, Oly. 2021. Principles of frugal innovation and its application by social entrepreneurs in times of adversity: An inductive single-case approach. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies* 13: 547–74. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
71. Mishra, Oly, Richa Sharma, and Bindu Agrawal. 2020. Facilitating Women Prosperity with Higher Purpose at Vyomini. *South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases* 9: 198–207. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
72. Molina-Maturano, Janet, Stijn Speelman, and Hans De Steur. 2020. Constraint-based innovations in agriculture and sustainable development: A scoping review. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 246: 119001. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
73. Muhamad, Suriyani, Noraida Ali, Masita Masila Abdul Jalil, Mutafa Man, and Suhairi Kamarudin. 2017. A sustainable E-business model for rural women: A case study. *Journal of Sustainability Science and Management* 12: 130–40. [[Google Scholar](#)]
74. Nambiar, Ek Sadanandan. 2019. Re-imagining forestry and wood business: Pathways to rural development, poverty alleviation and climate change mitigation in the tropics. *Forest Ecology and Management* 448: 160–73. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
75. Nandy, Paramesh, and Aminul Islam. 2010. Climate resilient coastal zone development in Bangladesh: Participatory governance for common resources management. In *Management and Sustainable Development of Coastal Zone Environments*. Edited by

- Allagapan Ramanathan, Prosun Bhattacharya, Thorsten Dittmar, Mathukumali Bala Krishna Prasad and Buddhi Raj Neupane. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 58–72. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
76. Ningrum, Vanda. 2018. Does Engage Youth in Agriculture Support National Food Sovereignty?: Empirical Evidence from Indonesian Rural Area. In *32nd International Business Information Management Association Conference, IBIMA 2018 Vision 2020: Sustainable Economic Development and Application of Innovation Management from Regional Expansion to Global Growth*. Edited by Khalid Soliman. King of Prussia: IBIMA, pp. 2115–22. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
77. Nwosu, Ijeoma Ikejiofor, Rita Oluchi Onoyima, Ignatius Ani Madu, and Victor Chukwunweike Nwokocha. 2019. The socioeconomic effects of small-scale women businesses in broom production and marketing industry: A panacea for sustainable development. *Journal of Enterprising Communities* 13: 283–95. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
78. Nzama, Antonia. 2021. Tackling climate change through craft development: The case of rural women in uPhongolo Local Municipality. *Jamba: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies* 13: a1140. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
79. Ojo, Elizabeth, Ismet Anitsal, and Mera Anitsal. 2015. Poverty among Nigerian women entrepreneurs: A call for diversification of sustainable livelihood in agricultural entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship* 19: 167–78. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
80. Oliveira, Hugo, and Gil Penha-Lopes. 2020. Permaculture in Portugal: Social-ecological inventory of a re-ruralizing grassroots movement. *European Countryside* 12: 30–52. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
81. Oteng-Ababio, Martin, Augustine Tanle, Samuel Twumasi Amoah, Louis Kusi, Enoch Akwasi Kosoe, and Ernets Bagson. 2019. ‘Informal Exceptionalism?’ Labour Migrants’ Creative Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Livelihoods in Accra, Ghana. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 54: 88–103. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[Green Version\]](#)
82. Otoijamun, Itohan, Moses Kigozi, Sikiru Ottan Abdulraman, Adelana Rasak Adetunji, and Asikiwe Peter Onwualu. 2021. Fostering the Sustainability of Artisanal and Small-Scale Mining (ASM) of Barite in Nasarawa State, Nigeria. *Sustainability* 13: 5917. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
83. Palmas, Karl, and Jonas Lindberg. 2013. Livelihoods or ecopreneurship? Agro-economic experiments in Hambantota, Sri Lanka. *Journal of Enterprising Communities* 7: 125–35. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
84. Papzan, Abdolhami, Kiumars Zarafshani, Malekeh Tavakoli, and Mahya Papzan. 2008. Determining factors influencing rural entrepreneurs’ success: A case study of Mahidasht township in Kermanshah province of Iran. *African Journal of Agricultural Research* 3: 597–600. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
85. Pato, Maria Lúcia, and Aurora Amélia Castro Teixeira. 2016. Twenty Years of Rural Entrepreneurship: A Bibliometric Survey. *Sociologia Ruralis* 56: 3–28. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
86. Pato, Maria Lúcia, and Aurora Amélia Castro Teixeira. 2018. Rural entrepreneurship: The tale of a rare event. *Journal of Place Management and Development* 11: 46–59. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

87. Poon, Jessie, Diep Thai, and Deborah Naybor. 2012. Social capital and female entrepreneurship in rural regions: Evidence from Vietnam. *Applied Geography* 35: 308–15. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
88. Rajendran, Jisha, and Kavita Indapurkar. 2020. Challenges in Tourism Entrepreneurship A Thematic Analysis. *Test Engineering and Management* 82: 9240–45. [[Google Scholar](#)]
89. Ramaano, Azwindini Isaac. 2021. Tourism development dilemmas in Musina Municipality: Evidence from the Big Tree Nature Reserve and neighboring entities, Vhembe district, South Africa. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 1–19, ahead-of-print. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Rebotier, Julien. 2012. Vulnerability conditions and risk representations in Latin-America: Framing the territorializing urban risk. *Global Environmental Change* 22: 391–98. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Remilien, Emmanuel, Manuel Sanchez-Hernandez, Hilario Hernández-Salgado, Roselina Servin-Juárez, and Ignacio Carranza-Cerda. 2018. Creation profiles of microenterprises in rural zones: The case of Santa Barbara Almoloya, Cholula, Puebla. *Agricultura Sociedad y Desarrollo* 15: 29–45. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)] [[Green Version](#)]
92. Robbins, Keith, and John Pearce. 1993. Entrepreneurial retrenchment among small manufacturing firms. *Journal of Business Venturing* 8: 301–18. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
93. Samal, Prasanna K., Er. Mahendra S. Lodhi, Satish C. Arya, Rakesh C. Sundriyal, and Pitambar P. Dhyani. 2016. Eco-technologies for agricultural and rural livelihoods in North East India. *Current Science* 111: 1929–35. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Sati, Mahesh Chandra, and Rajendra Prasat Juyal. 2008. A gender approach to sustainable rural development of mountains: Women/s success in agro-enterprises in the Indian Central Himalayan region. *Mountain Research and Development* 28: 8–12. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
95. Schraeder, Brittany, Eva Bonta, Eric Obeysekare, and Khajan Mehta. 2015. Co-located community health and economic activity centers. Paper presented at 5th IEEE Global Humanitarian Technology Conference, GHTC, Seattle, WA, USA, December 3; pp. 144–51. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
96. Scoones, Ian. 1998. *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis*. IDS Working Paper, Issue 72. Brighton: IDS. [[Google Scholar](#)]
97. Serna, Ciro Alfonso, Mirosława Czerny, Abraham Allec Pineda, and Oscar Alonso Vélez Rojas. 2015. Livelihood assessment in district 1 of Medellín Colombia. *Miscellanea Geographica* 19: 9–20. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)] [[Green Version](#)]
98. Shahraki, Hassan, and Ebrahim Heydari. 2019. Rethinking rural entrepreneurship in the era of globalization: Some observations from Iran. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research* 9: 1–26. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
99. Shaker, Richard Ross. 2015. The spatial distribution of development in Europe and its underlying sustainability correlations. *Applied Geography* 63: 304–14. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
100. Shaw, Brian. 2017. The whole village project Saxon village restoration in rural Romania. In *The Science and Practice of Landscape Stewardship*. Edited by Claudia Bieling and Tobias Plieninger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 164–66. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

101. Siegner, Meike, and Rajat Kozak. 2021. Community forest enterprises and social enterprises: The confluence of two streams of literatures for sustainable natural resource management. *Social Enterprise Journal* 17: 584–603. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
102. Singh, Ramendra, Vaibhav Gupta, and Akash Mondal. 2012. Jugaad-From “Making Do” and “Quick Fix” to an Innovative, Sustainable and Low-Cost Survival Strategy at the Bottom of the Pyramid. *International Journal of Rural Management* 8: 87–105. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
103. Smith, Richard. 2015. Ending poverty in Mongolia: From socialism to social development. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 24: 159–69. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)] [[Green Version](#)]
104. Stone, Lesego, Morn Stone, and Gya Nyaupane. 2021. The state of tourism and community development research and future directions. *Tourism Review International* 25: 79–88. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
105. Sutter, Christopher, Garry Bruton, and Juanyi Chen. 2019. Entrepreneurship as a solution to extreme poverty: A review and future research directions. *Journal of Business Venturing* 34: 197–214. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
106. Tabares, Alexander. 2017. International entrepreneurship under an institutional regulative dimension: A cross-national study. *Espacios* 38: 2. [[Google Scholar](#)]
107. Tabares, Alexander, Yanto Chandra, Claudia Alvarez, and Manuela Escobar-Sierra. 2021. Opportunity-related behaviors in international entrepreneurship research: A multilevel analysis of antecedents, processes, and outcomes. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 17: 321–68. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
108. Terán, Eduardo, and Andrea Guerrero. 2020. Teorías de emprendimiento: Revisión crítica de la literatura y sugerencias para futuras investigaciones. *Espacios* 41: 7. [[Google Scholar](#)]
109. Wang, Hao, Jan Fidrmuc, Qi Luo, and Mingzhong Luo. 2020. Exploring the determinants of on-farm transitions: Evidence from rural China. *Applied Economics* 52: 5667–86. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
110. Wang, Wenxiong, Yunaquin Lan, and Xu Wang. 2021. Impact of livelihood capital endowment on poverty alleviation of households under rural land consolidation. *Land Use Policy* 109: 105608. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
111. Zhu, Ying, Hong Lan, David Ness, Ke Xing, Kris Schneider, Seung-Hee Lee, and Jing Ge. 2015. *Transforming Rural Communities in China and Beyond: Community Entrepreneurship and Enterprises, Infrastructure Development and Investment Modes*. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]