

ENERGIZING RURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACTIVITIES IN IMPROVING RURAL RESILIENCE IN INDONESIA THROUGH VILLAGE OWNED SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

MUHAMMAD SETIAWAN KUSMULYONO*

School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia. School of Business and Economics, Universitas Prasetiya Mulya. Corresponding author Email: muhammad_kusmulyono@sbm-itb.ac.id

WAWAN DHEWANTO

School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia.
Email: w_dhewanto@sbm-itb.ac.id

MELIA FAMIOLA

School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia.
Email: melia_famiola@sbm-itb.ac.id

Abstract

Villages play an essential strategic role in fostering a nation's economic development. However, the village is very vulnerable in managing local assets and human resources, which makes the optimization of the village economy not optimal. Entrepreneurship is one strategy used to strengthen village resilience. Village entrepreneurship may make the most of available opportunities and promote the independence and empowerment of village communities. The Local-owned Social Enterprise (VOSE) is a legal entity established to advance village welfare. VOSE is an example of rural entrepreneurship that can inspire the transformation of village capital so that it is more advantageous from an economic and financial standpoint. In addition to promoting the development of the village's physical infrastructure and improving the performance of the area's rural businesses, VOSE is also responsible for facilitating market and financial access in the village, bridging knowledge transfer from the university, supporting regional government policy, and embracing the social networks of the rural community. Due to their ability to transform the community's available resources into a resilient village through collective entrepreneurial endeavors, VOSE jobs are of the utmost importance.

Keywords: rural, rural entrepreneurship, VOSE,

INTRODUCTION

Every country has its own definition about rural context. It resulted to variances in how rural entrepreneurship was constituted. In Indonesia, the majority of rural areas focus on the utilization of local resources, including agriculture, fishing, forestry, mining, and other natural resources. In Burundi, one of the African countries, most of the rural community still depended on traditional economic activities such as transforming crops, processing food, additional money from side work, and non-agricultural work (Cieslik & D'Aoust, 2018). However, it indicated that rural context in every country was in variance.

Meanwhile, many scholars and professionals are constantly arguing what really characterizes rurality. If social, economic, and ecological factors are combined, rurality will be specifically recognized (Psaltopoulos & Skuras, 2005; Shahraki & Heydari, 2019). However, in rural areas,

the size of the community, the environment, and the population density are also significant variables (Psaltopoulos & Skuras, 2005). On the contrary side, other academics anchored their definition of rural on geographic factors. Rural was shown through urban's periphery, which centralizes the issue of access, poverty, and inequality (Newbery et al., 2017). According to Vuković et al., (2018), rural areas are spaces where communities come together to support economic activity and provide a social portrait of social organization sensibility in a rural setting. This context also occurs in many rural areas in another country (Vuković et al., 2018).

Rural setting is not only having different discussion about community and local resources, but also the meaning of rural entrepreneurship. Rural entrepreneurship term is interchangeable with rural business and rural enterprise. While rural business or rural enterprise is the organization created by rural people to maximize opportunities, rural entrepreneurship discusses the process of maximizing resources for the benefit of the village. The important aim of rural development is to identify methods for improving the standard of living for rural communities, many of which are situated in distant places (Kolawole & Ajila, 2015). The sustainability of rural development program will be achieved when poverty situations is alleviated and more employment opportunities are available for the rural people (Kolawole & Ajila, 2015). However, rural entrepreneurship could be one of alternative strategy to ensure the sustainability of rural development program (Dabson et al., 2005).

Entrepreneurship is recognized as being one of the most strategic initiatives for reducing poverty and improving rural performance (Asitik et al., 2016). Entrepreneurship can preserve stronger connections in community that are scattered, small-scope and interdependence (Fuller-love et al., 2006). Rural entrepreneurship can facilitate the emergence of innovation and creativity that could have an impact on the greater society, allowing the entrepreneurial mindset to flourish and enabling the provision of high-quality local services to rural communities (Newbery et al., 2017; Petridou & Glaveli, 2008). Therefore, entrepreneurship in rural areas can be considered as an element that adds value to the capital that rural communities already have (Korsgaard et al., 2015)

Rural entrepreneurship is also having challenges when encountering with the meaning of entrepreneurship in the rural areas. In opposition to rural entrepreneurship, which is more closely connected to the location of the business activity, rural entrepreneurship is more engaged with the interaction between the business' operations and its surrounding community's values (Korsgaard et al., 2015). Rural entrepreneurship won't generate difficulties for the business if it shifts its operations physically. Rural entrepreneurship, however, is a sector of the economy that genuinely develops and integrates with nature, culture, history, tradition, and the ties to local capital that foster business expansion (Korsgaard et al., 2015; Shahraki & Heydari, 2019). Another researcher expanded the definition of rural enterprise to include establishments that are situated in rural areas, employ locals, increase the value added of the rural area, and sell rural goods like food or natural products, traditional crafts, or travel (Bosworth, 2012; Cieslik & D'Aoust, 2018). It is essential to have a conversation about the rural entrepreneurial context in order to strengthen rural principles and values. Most large-scale national businesses in Indonesia primarily used villages as production sites. By creating jobs,

these major corporations boosted economic expansion. Unfortunately, they are unable to increase the social impact or create local value. However, due to large scope of rural entrepreneurship definition, some scholars have already defined rural entrepreneurship in accordance with the various definitions that exist.

Table 1: Scholar Definition of Rural Entrepreneurship

Author	Definition
(Wortman, 1990)	Rural entrepreneurship is characterized by a new product from an agricultural product, serve or create a new market, and utilize a new technology.
(Stathopoulou et al., 2004)	Rural entrepreneurship is a business entity that related to physical environment, location, natural resources and landscape, social environment, social capital, and governance, economic environment, infrastructure and business network of enterprises
(Akgün et al., 2010)	Individual who is a community-based, strongly influence by social networking, and social traits of their rural space
(Bosworth, 2012)	Rural entrepreneurship is entrepreneurship activities that located in rural area, served local population, and sell rural products.
(Henry & McElwee, 2014)	Rural entrepreneurship is characterized by having location in rural area, recruited local people, and provided contribution to local value.
(L. Pato & Teixeira, 2018)	Rural entrepreneurship is an entrepreneurship activity that located in rural space, recruited local people, provided local services, and income flow to the local environment.
(Naminse & Zhuang, 2018)	In China, rural entrepreneurship is categorized as farmer entrepreneurship because most of rural is inhabited by farmer. Then, farmer entrepreneurship is defined as the ability to diversify farm, conduct agribusiness, and managed the risk to achieve higher gains.

According to some definitions provided by scholar, there are similarities in defining the rural entrepreneurship. First, majority of scholars stated about local people. In this situation we can consider local people as local community. The definition illustrated that rural entrepreneurship must invite and give impact for the local community. Secondly, definition discussed about local value that resulted from the process. Rural entrepreneurship is not only an enterprise that located in rural areas, but also contributed greater value to the local surroundings. Third relation is about the networking between the people within the village. Then, the last thing that had the similar types of rural entrepreneurship is about the local product which can be from agriculture, fisheries, or other fields.

Moreover, rural entrepreneurship does not only provide impact on the innovation and economic side. In the social aspect, entrepreneurship in rural areas enables occurrence of participatory processes intra-communities so that the community can give positive contribution to their village (López et al., 2019). Despite of their daily activities, such as farming, food processing, and other activities already entrepreneurship oriented (L. Pato & Teixeira, 2018), but these did not really supported by other stakeholders. Referring to this, entrepreneurship in rural areas has a multipurpose role not only on the economic side, but also the social side of society. Furthermore, entrepreneurship is also believed to be able to be a catalyst of the adverse effects

of changing trends on the current condition of society (Afrin et al., 2010; Fuller-love et al., 2006).

Based on the analysis of rural entrepreneurship arguments from some scholars, the Indonesian Village-owned Social Enterprises (VOSE) becomes one of the real applications of rural entrepreneurships in a rural organizational entity context. VOSE or known as Badan Usaha Milik Desa (Bumdes). VOSE is a village-based economic organization that strives to be the enabler that promotes the economic activity and public services in rural areas (Alfiansyah, 2021; UU Desa, 2014). VOSE was established based on the issue of the Rural Act No. 6 of 2014 that promotes villages to have greater control over their economy. It has been emphasized that VOSE is a social enterprise that functions on the basis of kinship and cooperation in order to achieve the village's overall welfare. VOSE is intended to become a social business unit which provides public services while also profiting financially.

In perspective of this, the study of VOSE operations can be approached by using social entrepreneurship theory concept. Therefore, as a social enterprise, an organization must simultaneously achieve economic and social performance (Dart, 2004). VOSE has a distinctive feature that no other social enterprise provides. VOSE is owned and legally established by the local village government, whereas other social enterprises are formed based on personal initiatives, group initiatives, or agreements of parties who have the same vision and mission to solve social problems in society. VOSE is also acknowledged on a national level because it is incorporated in the country's law via the National Rural Act, Work Creation Act, and regional laws. The village government, in conjunction with village deliberation, has the ultimate authority to construct a VOSE in their region that is in line with their local assets.

An introduction and preliminary analysis of rural entrepreneurship and VOSE shows that VOSE in Indonesia is able to become a representation of rural entrepreneurship activities. Therefore, this study aims to identify the role of VOSE as a representation of rural entrepreneurship to enable rural resilience in rural areas in Indonesia. VOSE has the appropriate criteria as an official communal institution that represents the community and village government to achieve prosperity in the village. Therefore, the research question in this study is how VOSE can embark rural resilience through ongoing operational VOSE activity.

The research objectives and questions come from a research gap where the concept of entrepreneurship has been viewed as exclusively profit-driven for some definitions. The presence of VOSE indicates that the implementation of entrepreneurship in rural areas must have a balanced orientation between financial profit and social benefits. The presence of the principle of entrepreneurship is expected to present a new discourse to become an alternative for sustainable development of villages and rural communities, especially in Indonesia, through the notion of rural resilience, which is still undergoing new topic.

The context of rural Indonesia, which differs from rural places in Europe, North America, and Africa, is the next novelty feature of this research. The principles of village culture, village leadership, and religious beliefs that are existing in Indonesian villages have varied features even though the rural setting is the subject of numerous arguments. In fact, the Community

Development Corporation (CDC) in North America is conceptually comparable to VOSE. CDC is an organization that formally seeks to enhance and develop local economic growth by collaborating with the roles of business corporations, public service organizations, and government agencies (Squazzoni, 2009). The difference between VOSE and CDC lies in the source of formality for establishing the business, where the concept of villages in Indonesia and America is very different. Villages in Indonesia are considered as legal, regional, and cultural units, and given more local authority to manage them through the implementation of the Rural Act. If VOSE and CDC was compared based on social entrepreneurship role in the society, both organizations shared the similar social business philosophy. However, VOSE comes with a different social business model with CDC, because VOSE was formally established by the local village government and has own legal entity.

The practical application of this research is that VOSE can manage the capital held by current stakeholders to improve their economic and social performance in the community. The welfare of the community will definitely be further enhanced as a result, allowing the community to flourish. By establishing solid relationships with key village stakeholders, VOSE can also improve the effectiveness and efficiency of its operations. On a theoretical level, this study helps create organizational entities that, in addition to SMEs and local governments, can optimize rural entrepreneurship activities. It is expected to inspire additional study on VOSE in regard to organization, leadership, marketing, and other managerial responsibilities.

METHODS

Village-owned Social Enterprises (VOSE) is a relatively novel entities in Indonesia rural concept but have already facing obstacles and difficulties. Thereby, it is essential to explore the role of VOSE in managing their performance to provide rural resiliency. Based on that intention, this research aims to advise role that should be conduct by VOSE to create rural resiliency in the village. This research will utilize qualitative approach as the research method by conducting interviews, examining the data, and taking a conclusion of the VOSE operations.

The informants for the research will be the stakeholder of VOSE. This study employed purposeful sampling and selected the VOSE based on their organization history, a recommendation from a VOSE specialist, a formal establishment letter from the village head, being operational for at least one year, and having a full management team. Based on that premise, this study visited fourteen VOSE in 4 provinces to interview with the management and village head about how VOSE can support rural resilience.

1. Bumdes Mitra Cibogo Sejahtera (Cisauk District, Tangerang Regency, Banten)
2. Bumdes Pagedangan Jaya Sejahtera (Pagedangan District, Tangerang Regency, Banten)
3. Bumdes Cisantana (Cigugur District, Kuningan Regency, West Java),
4. Bumdes Muktisari (Kalapanunggal District, Sukabumi Regency, West Java)

5. Bumdes Panggung Lestari (Sewon District, Bantul Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta).
6. Bumdes Sedyo Makmur (Kasih District, Bantul Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta)
7. Bumdes Makmur Mandiri (Kapanewon Berbah District, Sleman Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta)
8. Bumdes Tirto Mandiri (Polanharjo District, Klaten Regency, Central Java)
9. Bumdes Bodronoyo (Central Klaten District, Klaten Regency, Central Java)
10. Bumdes Mitra Paramarta (Kebonarum District, Klaten Regency, Central Java)
11. Bumdes Karya Usaha (Kebonarum District, Klaten Regency, Central Java)
12. Bumdes Bakti Manunggal (Kebonarum District, Klaten Regency, Central Java)
13. Bumdes Lumintu (Wedi District, Klaten Regency, Central Java)
14. Bumdes Ganeca (Wedi District, Klaten Regency, Central Java)

This study interviewed 38 people from 14 VOSEs starting from its VOSE Director, VOSE management team, and village head. This study started from early 2020 to end of 2021. So, there will be a limitation of this study related to the pandemic situation.

The qualitative data were examined using thematic analysis. Finding themes or patterns in a dataset is the goal of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Saunders et al., 2016). The interview's outcomes were documented in a transcript coupled with a coding system for identifying important details. After incorporating the interview findings, this study identifies the key themes or trends that appear in the data. Additionally, this study created a thematic summary of the data and contrasted it with preexisting ideas. Then, finally the last step is validating the findings before drawing conclusions.

To assess the quality of the research approach, validity and reliability tests are conducted in this study. This study was preceded by a thorough review that produced an initial understanding related to the research issue, which was later used to guide the process. In order to confirm the findings of the interviews, the researchers also triangulate by adding some additional interviews to some VOSE experts. To address dependability concerns, this study will outline the method for concluding as well as the phases in the research process and transcript data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of interviews with 38 informants provided some significant information related to things that affect the performance of a VOSE. Through the thematic analysis and coding process carried out, this study found at least several important aspects to be fulfilled by the role of a VOSE as a rural entrepreneurship activity to realize rural resilience.

Enabling the Market and Financial Access for the Village Economies

To increase access to markets and financial access is the first element of VOSE involvement in encouraging rural entrepreneurship in the area. The business method used by VOSE has numerous versions. By creating a business unit, VOSE can take on the role of the primary actor. The VOSE business unit will oversee the entire process in this circumstance, including input, processing, and output. VOSE Business Unit can be incorporated as a limited company or by another company formation. However, VOSE can also operate just as a distributor of regional goods produced by regional rural businesses. VOSE can act as a distributor, sales promoter, or in other capacities. Given this circumstance, market and financial access played a significant role in sustaining the flow of services and goods from rural areas. Market access may be offered by local governments, regional governments, and private groups like businesses that are open to forming business alliances.

On the other hand, financial access is needed to improve the cash flow and capital support for the operational activities (Fuller-love et al., 2006). This access can be supported from village government through additional capital injection, regional and central government by using grant system, or private organization such as bank or financial institutions who want to give grant or charity to the VOSE (Puri & Khoirunurrofik, 2021). VOSE can accept additional capital only from village budget, but available to have additional capital in VOSE business unit.

The role of VOSE as an enabler can be a catalyst for accelerating the development of existing businesses in the village, both businesses run by VOSE itself and other businesses in the village. This is also in line with the mission of VOSE, which is not to create a business that will make SME businesses that already exist in the village die. Therefore, the existence of VOSE as a market enabler and financial access can be an initial role to realize rural resilience.

Strengthening the Performance of Local Rural Business

Strengthening rural entrepreneurs' business models is the next step in developing rural entrepreneurship. This is required since the old business aid programs are not well suited for the present business sector (Bocken et al., 2019; Shahraki & Heydari, 2019). In addition to delivering added value that respects culture, rural entrepreneurs face issues that are becoming more complex (Cieslik & D'Acoust, 2018). Therefore, in order to ensure that their company operations can reach shared objectives, rural entrepreneurs need to become familiar with the process, context, and consequence (Vernet et al., 2019).

However, rural business ventures may not necessarily guarantee a successful end result that everyone can share. The largest obstacle is that the village's economy is supported by other factors as well, such as agriculture (Maria L. Pato & Teixeira, 2016). Villages with agricultural, coastal, forest, mountain, or lowland backgrounds typically rely on farmers, planters, or fisherman for their primary source of revenue. Without a compelling justification, the existence of rural entrepreneurship will be interpreted as a transition away from a profession that is

nature-oriented toward one that is processing-oriented. Moreover, rural entrepreneurs who lack good fundamental business planning and psychological wellness may experience concern feelings about a profit-seeking addiction.

A variety of advantages can be derived from rural entrepreneurship activity. Rural entrepreneurs can create more jobs while maximizing the utilization of village resources and reducing rural capital stagnation (Hosseinzade et al., 2018; Maria Lúcia Pato & Teixeira, 2016). According to Korsgaard et al., (2015), rural entrepreneurs' ingenuity can add to the quality of rural services in areas like tourism . Additionally, the existence of entrepreneurship was able to attract the interest of rural business owners in enhancing the performance of their enterprises in order to benefit additional rural areas (Korsgaard et al., 2015).

Local rural businesses and rural entrepreneurs play a big part in raising the village's level of welfare. The village is more likely to be independent if there are more rural entrepreneurs there. Rural business owners can profit by collaborating with VOSE to increase their company's income and size since VOSE may act as a business enabler.

Encouraging Village Physical Infrastructure Establishment and Improvement

Physical infrastructure in some developing nations may be an impediment to business performance (Vernet et al., 2019). While appropriate business infrastructure is required for rural entrepreneurial activities to expand, in some rural areas, physical infrastructure issues including road condition, logistic transportation, and other related infrastructures are still becoming major obstacles (Detelj et al., 2018; Vernet et al., 2019). Access to money, markets, and technology can be a beneficial prerequisite for enhancing the entrepreneurial capital of rural entrepreneurs through supportive infrastructure (Afrin et al., 2010; Rustiadi & Nasution, 2017; Sseguya et al., 2018). A solid infrastructure is also an encouragement for rural entrepreneurs to realize product diversification, so they are not overly reliant on a single and repetitive resource (Petridou & Glaveli, 2008; Shahraki & Heydari, 2019). Fortunately, the Rural Act's execution served as the cornerstone for the distribution of village funds, which may be used to build local infrastructure.

As a village partner in fostering village community welfare, VOSE may request that villages allocate funds from the village fund to support infrastructure development growth. The village fund is a legal requirement that promotes the central government to give each village an annual allocation of 1 billion rupiah (about 67,000 USD) for village development. These funds are typically employed for infrastructure construction and village activity operation. However, VOSE can influence village governments to provide infrastructure improvements a higher priority in order to enhance the efficiency of local economic activities. Furthermore, certain services that are still of a social nature may be managed by the community before VOSE receives the business embryo to continue.

Bridging the Transfer Knowledge from University

The village with the depopulation issue is confronted with a lack of human capital. Knowledgeable villagers made the decision to leave the village and go for better employment

in cities. By working in cooperation and partnership with the university, this problem can be resolved. Universities in Indonesia have community outreach as a pillar of higher education, which can be utilized to support villages by implementing community development initiatives within. Additionally, knowledge transfer is necessary for strengthening human capital among stakeholders and businesspeople who work with rural entrepreneurs. Several parties, notably higher education institutions, can collaborate on this responsibility (Lehmann et al., 2009).

VOSE can bridge the transfer of knowledge with universities through the community service program. However, the implementation of a community service program is certainly not easy, both from the willingness of tertiary institutions and the openness of the village community to accept the programs. Some research indicated that one of the problems that complicates the relationship between villages and university is the lack of communication access between those parties (Detelj et al., 2018). On the other hand, university also experienced obstacles in terms of funding, staff support, and student desires (Zilahy et al., 2009). In fact, the hardest thing in this discourse is the desire of the lecturers to go to the field and conduct service activities because the rewards of teaching and research are more attractive (Henry & McElwee, 2014; L. Pato & Teixeira, 2018; Zilahy et al., 2009).

VOSE can become a trusted organization and has more value in the eyes of university because now it has a clear formal element. This will greatly assist university in managing activities and recognizing the programs that have been carried out together. When the community service program is implemented, all aspects of the village will be able to feel the benefits.

Reinforcing Regional Government Policy

Actually, the Rural Act's mandate allows village governments to manage their villages on a self-authority premise. Unfortunately, VOSE also requires support from the higher echelons of the district, regency, or province in order to develop the economic and social activities in the village. This policy gives VOSE the right to compete with regular business. This policy may address a variety of topics, including market access, financial access, and other advantageous access.

Unfortunately, the political atmosphere in rural Indonesian villages is quite dynamic. Even though the rules are clearly forth in the Rural Act, the village head, who holds the highest post in village administration, has very broad authority. According to Article 26 of the Rural Act, the village head's responsibilities include setting up village government, carrying out village development, encouraging village community development, and giving the village community more power.

The variance of the authority of the village head makes the position of the village head central in strategic decision making in the village. Additionally, the direct election of village head has emerged as a distinctive dynamic in village politics. The campaigning for village head candidates frequently resembles that of presidential elections. The Rural Act's mandate also extends the tenure of the village head from the current six years. This choice forced the village head to play a more strategic role in the community and created opportunities for power struggles. In order to ensure the success of the community development program in the village,

it is crucial to have a solid relationship with the village head. The existence of VOSE can be another way for the village head to show his role to the community. Although in certain situations there may be misunderstandings about leadership between the VOSE director and the village head, this can be resolved through communication. Good communication between the VOSE director and the village head will encourage stronger village head stewardship and make VOSE activities more streamlined.

Embracing Social Networks of Community

The most valuable asset that the villagers own is their social capital. Compared to urban surroundings, the village has a very massive social capital. Social organizations' networks, norms, and beliefs are all examples of social capital. These elements enable coordination and cooperation to achieve shared objectives. The village's social capital is its most valuable resource for boosting morale in areas where residents are suffering from the effects of climate change and the absence of a strong government (Bodorkós & Pataki, 2009). Strong relationships created by social capital can also inspire locals to create new opportunities and handle environmental challenges (Byg & Herslund, 2016).

Families with higher social capital will benefit more from improvements in food security than those with weaker ties, as evidenced by their positive relationships with the environment and participation in their communities (Sseguya et al., 2018). Additionally, social capital is crucial for facilitating the exchange of knowledge and information among residents and promoting sensible decision-making, particularly when it comes to distributing scarce resources (WorldBank, 2009). In addition, social capital plays a bigger part in rural poverty reduction than human capital (Byg & Herslund, 2016; Rustiadi & Nasution, 2017). If social, natural, and human capital cannot be converted into economic capital, they will become ordinary capital. Therefore, VOSE is essential to attempts to combine and transform already-existing human capital, natural capital, and social capital into advantages for the village's economy and society. This is possible due to VOSE's greater agility in tasks requiring the prevailing spirit of rural entrepreneurship. As a result, VOSE can pair up with the village government as a strategic partner to assist address economic issues facing the community and optimize opportunities to better utilize its resources.

CONCLUSION

In terms of financial capital, operating systems, automation, and managerial skills, rural entrepreneurs are not comparable to large companies that possess factories in the village. Therefore, for rural entrepreneurship to thrive and benefit rural areas more broadly, it needs the participation of a variety of stakeholders. VOSE is an example of the sort of rural entrepreneurship practiced in Indonesia that complies with the traditions, morals, and laws observed in the country's rural communities. VOSE is a village-based economic organization that works to support the development of public services and economic activity in rural areas. Through the provision of social benefits and the ability to conduct their activities in a healthy way, VOSE plays a role in enhancing village welfare. VOSE has various roles that need to be modified in their carrying out work plan in order to implement resilience within a village

community. VOSE's responsibilities include facilitating market and financial access in the village, promoting the development of the village's physical infrastructure, enhancing the performance of the area's rural businesses, bridging knowledge transfer from the university, supporting regional government policy, and embracing the social networks of the rural community. VOSE roles are extremely significant since they can convert the village's available capital into economic capital and receive formal acknowledgment for their efforts.

The overall role of VOSE in achieving rural resilience definitely demands for the participation of current residents and communities, executive support from the village head, and an advancement in the organization's level of professionalism. VOSE is a standout example of a village's entrepreneurial entities that may assist village welfare without compromising the distinctiveness of the community's existing traditional culture and values. Village governments can benefit from working with VOSE to achieve rural resilience. Entrepreneurship and resilience are effectively discussed simultaneously. In order to further understand the technical aspects of implementing VOSE's function in fostering rural resilience in villages and how this might be duplicated in other rural regions, more research is required. This study is anticipated to increase the village's influence on a nation's economy by enabling it to become a self-sufficient, empowered village that makes use of local resources.

References

- Afrin, S., Islam, N., & Ahmed, S. U. (2010). Microcredit and Rural Women Entrepreneurship Development in Bangladesh: A Multivariate Model. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(1), 9–37.
- Akgün, A. A., Nijkamp, P., Baycan, T., & Brons, M. (2010). Embeddedness of entrepreneurs in rural areas: A comparative rough set data analysis. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 101(5), 538–553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2010.00630.x>
- Alfiansyah, A. (2021). Status Badan Usaha Milik Desa Sebagai Badan Hukum Atas Diundangkannya Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja. *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan)*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.36312/jisip.v5i2.1991>
- Asitik, A. J., Sharpley, R., & Phelan, C. (2016). Establishing the Link Between Entrepreneurship, Built Capital and Poverty Reduction in Rural Northern Ghana. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 9(2), 493–507.
- Ayala, J. C., & Manzano, G. (2014). The resilience of the entrepreneur. Influence on the success of the business. A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 42(August), 126–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2014.02.004>
- Bakker, M. (2019). A Conceptual Framework for Identifying the Binding Constraints to Tourism-Driven Inclusive Growth. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 16(5), 575–590. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2018.1541817>
- Bocken, N., Boons, F., & Baldassarre, B. (2019). Sustainable business model experimentation by understanding ecologies of business models. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 208, 1498–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.159>
- Bodorkós, B., & Pataki, G. (2009). Linking academic and local knowledge: community-based research and service learning for sustainable rural development in Hungary. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 17(12), 1123–1131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2009.02.023>

- Bosworth, G. (2012). Characterising rural businesses - Tales from the paperman. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 28(4), 499–506. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2012.07.002>
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). What Makes a Social Class ? On The Theoretical and Practical Existence Of Groups Author (s): Pierre Bourdieu Source : *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* , Vol . 32 (1987), pp . 1-17 Published by : Regents of the University of California Stable URL : <http://.berkeleyjournalofsociology.com>, 32(1987), 1–17.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bullough, A., Renko, M., & Myatt, T. (2014). Danger zone entrepreneurs: The importance of resilience and self-efficacy for entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 38(3), 473–499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12006>
- Byg, A., & Herslund, L. (2016). Socio-economic changes , social capital and implications for climate change in a changing rural Nepal. *GeoJournal*, 169–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-014-9611-5>
- Cieslik, K., & D’Aoust, O. (2018). Risky Business? Rural Entrepreneurship in Subsistence Markets: Evidence from Burundi. *European Journal of Development Research*, 30(4), 693–717. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-017-0100-9>
- Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new Resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113>
- Dabson, B., Levere, A., Pate, K., Appel, E., Malkin, J., & Schweke, B. (2005). Entrepreneurship as a rural economic development strategy Entrepreneurship as a Rural Economic Development Strategy. *Rural Research Report*, 16(10), 9.
- Dart, R. (2004). Being “business-like” in a nonprofit organization: A grounded and inductive typology. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(2), 290–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764004263522>
- Detelj, K., Kedmenec, I., & Vukovic, K. (2018). Service Learning As a Lever for Rural Social Entrepreneurship Development in Croatia. *Economic and Social Development: Book of Proceedings*, November, 461–468.
- Fuller-love, N., Midmore, P., Thomas, D., & Henley, A. (2006). Entrepreneurship and rural economic development : a scenario analysis approach. 12(5), 289–305. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550610687655>
- Henry, C., & McElwee, G. (2014). Exploring Rural Enterprise: New Perspectives on Research, Policy & Practice. *Contemporary Issues in Entrepreneurship Research*, 4, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1108/s2040-7246_2014_0000004012
- Hosseinzade, M., Jafari, H., & Ahmadian, M. A. (2018). Cadmium distribution in soils of Dnipropetrovsk oblast and its accumulation in crop production. *Ukrainian Journal of Ecology*, 8(1), 910–917. <https://doi.org/10.15421/2018>
- Hunt, W., Vanclay, F., Birch, C., Coutts, J., Flittner, N., & Williams, B. (2011). A gricultural extension : Building capacity and resilience in rural industries and communities. 20(2), 112–127.
- Kolawole, O. D., & Ajila, K. (2015). Driving local community transformation through participatory rural entrepreneurship development. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management, and Sustainable Development*, 11(2), 131–139. <https://doi.org/10.1108/WJEMSD-06-2014-0016>
- Korber, S., & Mcnaughton, R. B. (2017). Resilience and entrepreneurship : A systematic literature review *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* Article information : *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, August 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-10-2016-0356>

- Korsgaard, S., Tanvig, H. W., Müller, S., & Tanvig, H. W. (2015). Rural entrepreneurship or entrepreneurship in the rural – between place and space. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 21(1), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-11-2013-0205>
- Lehmann, M., Christensen, P., Thrane, M., Herreborg, T., & Jørgensen, T. H. (2009). University engagement and regional sustainability initiatives: some Danish experiences. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 17(12), 1067–1074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.03.013>
- López, M., Cazorla, A., & Panta, M. del P. (2019). Rural entrepreneurship strategies: Empirical experience in the northern sub-plateau of Spain. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11051243>
- Madsen, W., & Mullan, C. O. (2014). ‘Knowing me, knowing you’: Exploring the effects of a rural leadership programme on community resilience. *Rural Society*, 23(2), 151–160.
- Magis, K. (2010). Community resilience: An indicator of social sustainability. *Society and Natural Resources*, 23(5), 401–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920903305674>
- Naminse, E. Y., & Zhuang, J. (2018). Does farmer entrepreneurship alleviate rural poverty in China? Evidence from guangxi province. *PLoS ONE*, 13(3), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194912>
- Newbery, R., Siwale, J., & Henley, A. (2017). Rural entrepreneurship theory in the developing and developed world. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 18(1), 3–4. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465750316686232>
- Pato, L., & Teixeira, A. A. C. (2018). Rural entrepreneurship : the tale of a rare event. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 11(1), 46–59. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPMD-08-2017-0085>
- Pato, Maria L., & Teixeira, A. A. C. (2016). Twenty Years of Rural Entrepreneurship: A Bibliometric Survey. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56(1), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12058>
- Pato, Maria Lúcia, & Teixeira, A. A. C. C. (2016). Twenty Years of Rural Entrepreneurship: A Bibliometric Survey. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56(1), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12058>
- Petridou, E., & Glaveli, N. (2008). Rural women entrepreneurship within co-operatives: Training support. *Gender in Management*, 23(4), 262–277. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17542410810878077>
- Psaltopoulos, D., & Skuras, D. (2005). The Location of Markets , Perceived Entrepreneurial Risk , and Start-up Capital of Micro Rural Firms. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-003-645>
- Puri, I. T., & Khoirunrofik, K. (2021). The Role of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDES) for The Village Community Economy. *Economics Development Analysis Journal*, 10(1), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.15294/edaj.v10i1.40823>
- Quaranta, G., & Salvia, R. (2014). AN INDEX TO MEASURE RURAL DIVERSITY IN THE LIGHT OF RURAL RESILIENCE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT DEBATE. *European Countryside*, 2, 161–178. <https://doi.org/10.2478/euco-2014-0009>
- Rustiadi, E., & Nasution, A. (2017). Can Social Capital Investment Reduce Poverty in Rural Indonesia ? *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issue*, 7(2), 109–117.
- Sánchez-Zamora, P., & Gallardo-Cobos, R. (2019). Diversity, disparity and territorial resilience in the context of the economic crisis: An analysis of rural areas in Southern Spain. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11061743>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research Methods for Business Students (7th ed.)*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Schwarz, A. M., Béné, C., Bennett, G., Boso, D., Hilly, Z., Paul, C., Posala, R., Sibiti, S., & Andrew, N.

- (2011). Vulnerability and resilience of remote rural communities to shocks and global changes: Empirical analysis from Solomon Islands. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(3), 1128–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.04.011>
- Shahraki, H., & Heydari, E. (2019). Rethinking rural entrepreneurship in the era of globalization : some observations from Iran. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(9:42), 1–26. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-019-0162-6>
 - Squazzoni, F. (2009). Local economic development initiatives from the bottom-up: The role of community development corporations. *Community Development Journal*, 44(4), 500–514. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn009>
 - Sseguya, H., Mazur, R. E., & Flora, C. B. (2018). Social capital dimensions in household food security interventions : implications for rural Uganda United States Department of Agriculture. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 35(1), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-017-9805-9>
 - Stathopoulou, S., Psaltopoulos, D., & Skuras, D. (2004). Rural entrepreneurship in Europe: A research framework and agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 10(6), 404–425. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550410564725>
 - Torkelsson, A. (2007). Resources , Not Capital : A Case Study of the Gendered Distribution and Productivity of Social Network Ties in Rural Ethiopia *. *Rural Sociology*, 72(4), 583–607.
 - UU Desa, (2014).
 - Vernet, A., Khayesi, J. N. O., George, V., George, G., & Bahaj, A. S. (2019). How does energy matter? Rural electrification, entrepreneurship, and community development in Kenya. *Energy Policy*, 126(June 2017), 88–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.11.012>
 - Vuković, M., Prvulović, I., & Urošević, S. (2018). Factors of Success and Motivation of Rural Entrepreneurship in Eastern Serbia. *Journal Economics of Agriculture*, 3(65), 1085–1097. <https://doi.org/10.5937/ekoPolj1803085V>
 - Walker, B., & Salt, D. (2012). Resilience practice: Building capacity to absorb disturbance and maintain function. In *Resilience Practice: Building Capacity to Absorb Disturbance and Maintain Function* (pp. 1–227). <https://doi.org/10.5822/978-1-61091-231-0>
 - WorldBank. (2009). Banking the Poor: Measuring Banking Access in 54 Economies. In *Yale Journal on Regulation: Vol. Vol. 21 (Issue 121)*.
 - Wortman, M. S. (1990). Rural Entrepreneurship Research : An Integration into the Entrepreneurship Field. *Agribusiness*, 6(4), 329.
 - Zilahy, G., Huisingh, D., Melanen, M., Phillips, V. D., & Sheffy, J. (2009). Roles of academia in regional sustainability initiatives: outreach for a more sustainable future. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 17(12), 1053–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.03.006>
 - Zwiers, S., Markantoni, M., & Strijker, D. (2018). The role of change- and stability-oriented place attachment in rural community resilience: A case study in south-west Scotland. *Community Development Journal*, 53(2), 281–300. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsw020>