

Innovative Livelihood Restoration Program: Integrating Skills Development, Microfinance, and Local Market Opportunities

2369

Neneng Nurbaeti Amien^{1*}, N. Neni Triana², Imran Karo Karo³

¹Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung; Bandung, Indonesia

²Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Buana Perjuangan Karawang; Telukjambe, Indonesia

³Department of Entrepreneurship, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Satya Terra Bhinneka; Medan, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author E-Mail: neneng.nurbaeti@gmail.com

Submitted:
February 24, 2026

Revised:
March 16, 2026

Accepted:
April 28, 2026

Published Online:
May 31, 2026

ABSTRACT

Livelihood restoration efforts in post-crisis contexts often rely on fragmented approaches, focusing separately on skills development, microfinance, or market access, which limits their effectiveness in achieving sustainable recovery. Despite their potential, there is still a lack of integrated models that examine how these components interact to strengthen long-term economic resilience among vulnerable populations. This study examines the integration of skills development, microfinance, and local market access as a comprehensive approach to livelihood restoration in post-crisis settings. Using a qualitative methodology, specifically a literature review, the study explores the role of these three components in fostering sustainable economic recovery. The data analysis indicates that when combined, these elements lead to a significant improvement in income generation, business growth, and employment outcomes. However, challenges such as market fragmentation, lack of coordination, digital adoption, and external socio-political factors are identified as barriers to success. The findings confirm that an integrated approach, which aligns skills development, microfinance, and market access, yields better results than individual interventions. The study emphasizes the need for context-specific, coordinated efforts to overcome barriers and ensure the long-term sustainability of livelihood restoration programs.

Keywords: Integrated Approach, Livelihood Restoration, Local Market Access, Microfinance, Skills Development.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of livelihood restoration has garnered increasing attention in development studies, particularly in the context of communities affected by disaster or socio-economic shifts. The integration of skills development, microfinance, and local market opportunities into livelihood restoration programs has shown promising results in fostering sustainable economic recovery. However, despite the growing body of literature on this subject, there remains a significant gap in understanding how these three components interact to promote long-term resilience among vulnerable populations. As global challenges such as climate change, conflict, and economic inequality intensify, addressing livelihood restoration in a comprehensive and sustainable manner becomes more crucial (Smit & Wandel, 2006).

While numerous studies have examined microfinance as a tool for poverty alleviation and the importance of skills development in enhancing economic opportunities, few have explored the synergy between these elements within the context of livelihood restoration programs (McKenzie & Woodruff, 2008; Banerjee et al., 2015). Furthermore, the role of

JIMKES

Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen
Kesatuan
Vol. 14 No. 3, 2026
pp. 2369-2378
IBI Kesatuan
ISSN 2337 – 7860
E-ISSN 2721 – 169X
DOI: 10.37641/jimkes.v14i3.5178

local markets as a critical element in ensuring the sustainability of microenterprises has been overlooked in many studies (De Mel et al., 2008). This gap highlights the need for further exploration into how these three components can be integrated effectively to create a holistic approach to livelihood restoration, especially in post-crisis recovery.

Previous studies by Gumede and Ehiane (2022) and Hendratmi et al. (2022) have examined livelihood issues from partial perspectives, such as the role of various forms of capital in women entrepreneurs' survival strategies and the challenges of post-settlement following land restoration. However, existing research by Karlan and Valdivia (2011) and Parera et al. (2025) largely focuses on isolated interventions, including skills training or microfinance, without adequately exploring how these components can be strategically integrated for more effective livelihood outcomes. Therefore, a significant research gap remains in developing a comprehensive and integrated approach that combines skills development, microfinance, and local market opportunities, which this study aims to address to provide a more holistic model of livelihood restoration.

This research is particularly timely given the increasing frequency of natural disasters, conflicts, and economic disruptions that push communities into precarious economic conditions. Moreover, with the growing recognition of the importance of community-driven solutions to economic recovery, this study aligns with calls for more innovative and locally rooted approaches to development (Chambers, 1997). The need for integrated approaches is also underscored by the growing body of literature on resilience, which emphasizes the importance of multifaceted strategies in building long-term sustainability (Folke et al., 2010).

The purpose of this article is to explore the integration of skills development, microfinance, and local market opportunities as a comprehensive model for livelihood restoration. Through a case study approach, this research seeks to examine the effectiveness of such an integrated model in promoting sustainable recovery and economic resilience. The study aims to contribute to the field by providing new insights into the dynamics of livelihood restoration programs and offering practical recommendations for practitioners and policymakers. The problem this research addresses is the lack of comprehensive models that combine multiple strategies to ensure sustainable livelihood recovery. The expected outcome is that this integrated model will offer a more effective pathway for communities affected by crisis to rebuild their livelihoods and enhance their resilience in the long term.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Innovative Livelihood

Innovative livelihood strategies refer to novel approaches that seek to empower individuals and communities by providing sustainable and diversified income opportunities, especially in the face of challenges such as economic instability, natural disasters, or conflicts. These strategies go beyond traditional livelihood interventions by incorporating creativity, adaptability, and resourcefulness to address the multifaceted challenges of vulnerable populations, such as climate change, population growth, land loss, declining livestock holdings, and land degradation, while aiming to achieve greater socio-economic resilience (Pollini & Galaty, 2021). An innovative livelihood approach often combines several elements such as skills development, microfinance, local market access, and the promotion of entrepreneurial ventures. Such integration fosters not only immediate economic recovery but also long-term resilience by equipping communities with the tools and resources to thrive independently (Bebbington, 1999).

Recent research by Hsieh et al. (2023) has emphasized the importance of combining multiple strategies, including non-traditional forms of employment, micro-enterprise development, and cooperative business models, to create opportunities that are both economically viable and socially inclusive. Innovative livelihoods also focus on leveraging local resources and capabilities to build sustainable economic opportunities that reduce dependency on external aid. By incorporating technology, local knowledge, and market-based solutions, innovative livelihood programs enhance the ability of

individuals to adapt to rapidly changing socio-economic environments, thus improving their overall well-being and self-sufficiency (Moser et al., 2001; Harinurdin et al., 2025).

In addition to enhancing economic stability, innovative livelihood strategies play a critical role in increasing social capital within communities. Through collaborative efforts such as group-based savings programs or collective entrepreneurship, individuals can form stronger networks and support systems that further promote community development and cohesion (Narayan, 2002; Bhatia-Kalluri, 2021). These strategies also emphasize the role of education and capacity building in creating new economic pathways, thus contributing to the broader goal of poverty alleviation and sustainable development (Chambers, 1997; Kurniawan & Ramadhan, 2025).

Integrated Approaches to Livelihood Restoration

The literature identifies skills development as a fundamental component of livelihood restoration programs. The acquisition of relevant skills significantly enhances individuals' capacity to generate income and improve their socio-economic conditions. Vocational training, for instance, enables individuals to access better employment opportunities and pursue self-employment, particularly in developing economies (McKenzie & Woodruff, 2008). Furthermore, entrepreneurship-oriented training has been associated with increased productivity and innovation (Vinogradova et al., 2023; Permatasari & Praswati, 2025). However, although skills development plays a crucial role in improving economic opportunities, it is often insufficient on its own to ensure long-term economic stability. Consequently, the integration of microfinance services into livelihood programs has been recognized as an essential strategy for bridging the gap between skill acquisition and the establishment of sustainable enterprises.

Microfinance has been widely acknowledged as an important mechanism for supporting individuals and microenterprises. Access to microcredit enables low-income individuals and small business owners to invest in productive assets, increase their income, and improve their living conditions (Banerjee et al., 2015; Manaf, 2017). Nevertheless, several studies highlight the limitations of microfinance when implemented independently, including high interest rates and restricted access to capital (Hulme & Mosley, 1996). These limitations underscore the importance of integrated approaches that combine microfinance with other livelihood interventions, such as skills development and market access.

Local market opportunities also play a significant role in ensuring the sustainability of livelihood restoration initiatives. Market access allows microenterprises to expand their sales, build business networks, and strengthen their capacity for growth. Research indicates that market access directly influences the profitability and sustainability of small businesses (De Mel et al., 2008). Moreover, the development of local markets can stimulate entrepreneurship and generate broader economic impacts within local communities (Hughes et al., 2008). However, several barriers, including market fragmentation, limited infrastructure, and competition from larger businesses, continue to constrain the effective integration of local markets. The literature suggests that an integrated approach combining skills development, microfinance, and market access is essential for establishing sustainable livelihood restoration programs. Such integrated strategies have the potential to address structural vulnerabilities while promoting long-term economic resilience among affected communities (Moser et al., 2001).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative literature review approach to examine the integration of skills development, microfinance, and local market access in livelihood restoration programs. It synthesizes secondary data from peer-reviewed articles, books, and reports to develop a comprehensive understanding and propose an integrated framework for post-crisis livelihood recovery, while also identifying gaps in existing models (Cooper et al., 2022; Harrison et al., 2011). The population consists of academic literature from both developed and developing contexts related to disaster recovery and economic resilience,

with the unit of analysis focused on documented outcomes of livelihood restoration programs combining training, microfinance access, and market engagement. As a fully secondary-data-based study, no primary data or human respondents are involved (Flick, 2022).

Data collection was performed through systematic searches in reputable academic databases such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Scopus. The inclusion criteria for the studies were empirical studies or reviews published in the last 15 years, studies that specifically focus on skills development, microfinance, and local market access as components of livelihood restoration programs, and studies that provide detailed outcomes or findings related to these three components. Key search terms included “livelihood restoration,” “skills development,” “microfinance,” “market access,” and “economic recovery.” Only peer-reviewed and credible sources were considered to ensure the reliability and academic rigor of the review. The review also prioritized sources from recognized institutions such as the International Labor Organization and the World Bank, which offer a rich body of work on the intersection of microfinance and livelihood development.

The data analysis for this literature review was performed using a thematic analysis approach, which allowed for the identification and synthesis of recurring themes and patterns across studies (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This method is particularly useful in qualitative research as it enables the researcher to organize and interpret a large volume of qualitative data in a coherent and meaningful way. The analysis focused on categorizing the various models of livelihood restoration, identifying how the integration of skills development, microfinance, and market access has been implemented in different contexts, and evaluating the success or limitations of these programs. The analysis also involved a critical review of the gaps in existing literature to highlight areas where further research is needed. This approach has been widely used in similar qualitative studies and provides a strong foundation for examining the effectiveness of integrated livelihood strategies.

To ensure the reliability and validity of the findings, the research followed a transparent and systematic process of literature selection, ensuring that only relevant, high-quality studies were included. The triangulation of data sources from various geographical regions and contexts strengthens the credibility of the findings (Flick, 2022). Additionally, by applying a clear and consistent methodology in the analysis of the studies, the research findings can be replicated by other scholars seeking to understand the effectiveness of integrated livelihood restoration models. The validity of the research is supported by the inclusion of recent studies and the use of peer-reviewed academic sources, which are considered to have high academic credibility (Pride & Knoth, 2018).

RESULTS

Livelihood Restoration: Skills Development, Microfinance, and Market Access

Training and skill development programs play a crucial role in strengthening both the economic and social capacity of individuals by building self-confidence, enhancing decision-making abilities, and increasing awareness of rights (Gupta, 2021). These programs significantly contribute to empowerment by enabling individuals to start businesses or improve their professional prospects, thereby reinforcing financial and social independence (Elneel & Almulhim, 2024). As such, skills development serves as a foundational component in promoting sustainable livelihoods and individual resilience.

The analysis of studies focusing on skills development showed that 75% of the studies reported positive impacts on employability and income generation. The findings align with previous research by McKenzie and Woodruff (2008) and Chakravarty et al. (2019), which emphasizes that vocational training programs enhance the ability of individuals to secure better jobs or establish businesses. However, a smaller proportion of studies (25%) found limited effects, primarily due to mismatched skills training that did not align with labor market demands, as noted by McIntosh and Zeitlin (2022). This mismatch can result in underemployment or an inability to capitalize on acquired skills fully. These findings

suggest that aligning training programs with local labor market needs is essential for maximizing the impact of skills development initiatives.

Microfinance plays a crucial role in advancing financial inclusion by offering access to essential financial services for individuals and small enterprises that are often excluded from formal banking systems, thereby enabling them to initiate, maintain, and grow their businesses (Iwuanyanwu et al., 2024). It also supports the continuous cash flow needed for daily consumption and business operations, especially for small-scale entrepreneurs (Bika et al., 2020). Furthermore, the integration of financial technology (fintech) has enhanced the effectiveness of microfinance by improving credit accessibility, operational efficiency, and scalability of financial services (Omowole et al., 2024).

Microfinance has proven to be an important tool in facilitating entrepreneurship and improving financial stability. A total of 22 studies focused on microfinance, most of them reporting increased business development and income for recipients of microloans. However, challenges such as high interest rates and low financial literacy were cited as barriers to the success of microfinance interventions. According to De Mel et al. (2008), microfinance services can be highly effective when paired with business training and financial education, helping recipients manage loans effectively and achieve long-term sustainability. Despite its potential, microfinance on its own may not always result in sustainable outcomes. As Hulme and Mosley (1996) point out, high-interest rates and a lack of business mentorship can severely limit the benefits of microcredit. These findings suggest that microfinance needs to be accompanied by additional support mechanisms, such as training on financial management and business strategies, to achieve greater success.

Access to local markets is widely recognized as a critical factor in ensuring the sustainability and growth of small businesses. Existing literature consistently shows that enterprises with stronger access to local markets tend to achieve higher survival rates and improved profitability. This is largely because local market integration provides microenterprises with essential channels to sell their products and build a stable customer base, thereby strengthening their economic position (De Mel et al., 2008; Bhatia, 2021). Beyond individual business benefits, local markets also contribute to broader economic development by supporting supply chain activities, where local businesses directly gain from increased transactions and circulation of goods and services. In this context, local markets play a vital role in job creation, retaining financial resources within communities, and offering fair trading opportunities for small-scale producers, particularly farmers (Arabska, 2018).

Moreover, local markets function not only as economic hubs but also as important social spaces that foster interaction and connectivity across different segments of society. They help establish urban–rural linkages and contribute to sustained community economic development by connecting producers and consumers within a shared ecosystem (Navapan & Charoenkit, 2022). However, despite these advantages, several structural challenges can limit the effectiveness of market access initiatives. Issues such as market fragmentation and inadequate infrastructure often restrict businesses from expanding their reach and accessing broader customer bases, ultimately constraining revenue generation and long-term growth (Nicole et al., 2021).

Challenges in Implementing Integrated Programs

Despite the positive outcomes of integrated programs, several implementation challenges persist, particularly related to weak coordination among key components such as skills training, microfinance, and market access. Without effective alignment, these elements may operate in isolation, leading to inefficiencies and reduced program impact. For example, microfinance institutions may provide loans to individuals who lack adequate training, resulting in underutilized funds, while market access initiatives may fail to match the actual needs of businesses (Kurniawan et al., 2022). In addition, microfinance institutions face emerging challenges related to digital transformation, especially in terms of data security and technology adoption. Research by Binaluyo et al.

(2024) shows that the integration of digital systems raises concerns about protecting sensitive financial information, with 55% of microfinance owners identifying data security as a major issue. Furthermore, limited internet access remains a barrier, as 40% of clients experience connectivity problems, while 35%, particularly older individuals or those with low digital literacy, struggle to use digital financial services effectively.

Another challenge is the logistical complexity of reaching remote or underserved areas. Chambers (1997) highlights that providing effective market access and training in isolated communities requires substantial infrastructure investment, which can be difficult in resource-constrained settings. Furthermore, political instability and weak governance structures often hamper the implementation of livelihood restoration programs. As Séjourné et al. (2018) note, these factors can affect the allocation of resources and undermine the success of market development efforts.

The success of livelihood restoration programs is also contingent on contextual factors such as political stability, infrastructure, and local socioeconomic conditions. Studies have shown that gender dynamics, for instance, can affect the success of skills development and microfinance programs, with women often facing greater barriers to accessing resources and markets (Chambers, 1997). Moreover, political instability and poor governance structures can interfere with the effective implementation of these programs, as noted by Ibrahim and Cheri (2013). This highlights the importance of tailoring interventions to the specific conditions of each community and considering external factors that may hinder program success.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reveal several significant insights into the integration of skills development, microfinance, and local market access in livelihood restoration programs. First, the analysis underscores the centrality of skills development in economic recovery. The findings support previous studies by McKenzie and Woodruff (2008) and Kovalev et al. (2025), who argue that market-aligned skills training significantly enhances the employability of individuals, allowing them to either find better jobs or become entrepreneurs. This is particularly relevant in the context of post-crisis recovery, where individuals often face challenges such as job loss, underemployment, and the lack of opportunities for economic mobility. However, our results also point to the fact that skills development alone does not guarantee success. As noted by Pitan and Adedji (2012), mismatched training programs that do not correspond to the actual needs of the labor market can lead to underemployment and dissatisfaction among program participants.

The role of microfinance as a catalyst for entrepreneurship and business development is also confirmed by the study's findings. Microcredit, when combined with business support services such as training and financial literacy programs, has been shown to enhance the ability of low-income individuals to grow their businesses and generate sustainable income (Banerjee et al., 2015). The positive results observed in this study are consistent with research by De Mel et al. (2008), who demonstrated that microfinance can have a substantial impact on business outcomes. The study identifies key barriers to microfinance effectiveness, including high interest rates, limited financial literacy, and a lack of mentorship. These findings support earlier research emphasizing that microfinance must be complemented by support systems to ensure long-term success (Hulme & Mosley, 1996). Therefore, a holistic approach combining capital access with financial education and business guidance is essential.

Another key finding of this study is the importance of local market access in ensuring the sustainability of microenterprises. The results corroborate the work of Chen et al. (2020), who emphasize that local market access is crucial for businesses to thrive and expand. Access to local markets not only provides a sales channel but also opens opportunities for networking, collaboration, and business development. This is especially pertinent in rural or underserved areas where market fragmentation and poor infrastructure limit the reach of businesses. The findings from this study also reflect the challenges highlighted by Kannan and Pohit (2021), who note that without adequate

infrastructure and market linkages, the benefits of local market access may be limited. Policymakers should focus on improving market connectivity and infrastructure to ensure that small businesses have the necessary tools to succeed.

This integrated model aligns with the theory of “multi-dimensional poverty” proposed by Moser et al. (2001), which suggests that poverty is a complex and multi-faceted issue that cannot be addressed through single interventions. Instead, a comprehensive approach that combines various interventions, such as education, financial support, and market access, addresses the different dimensions of poverty and increases the chances of successful recovery. The integrated approach not only creates synergies between these components but also ensures that individuals and communities are better equipped to cope with future shocks, which is critical in building long-term resilience (Smit & Wandel, 2006).

The study highlights several challenges in implementing integrated livelihood restoration programs, particularly the lack of coordination among microfinance institutions, skills training providers, and market access initiatives, which can reduce overall effectiveness and lead to misaligned program outcomes. In addition, emerging issues such as data security risks, limited internet access, and low digital literacy further constrain the effectiveness of microfinance services, especially in the context of increasing digitalization (Dingsøyr et al., 2018). Additional barriers include logistical difficulties in reaching remote areas, often compounded by political instability and weak governance (Chambers, 1997). Moreover, contextual factors such as gender dynamics, infrastructure, and political conditions significantly influence program outcomes, with women facing specific barriers to economic participation and fragile governance environments further limiting program success (Kronick & Rodríguez, 2023).

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that integrating skills development, microfinance, and local market access effectively promotes sustainable livelihood restoration by improving income, business growth, and employment outcomes, while enhancing long-term economic resilience. However, its implementation faces challenges, particularly the lack of coordination among program components and external barriers such as market fragmentation, political instability, and infrastructure limitations. The findings imply that livelihood restoration programs should adopt an integrated approach combining skills development, microfinance, and market access to achieve more effective and sustainable outcomes. Policymakers and practitioners need to ensure strong coordination and alignment with local contexts to maximize program impact and long-term economic resilience.

This study has several limitations, as it relies solely on secondary data from existing literature, which may limit the ability to capture real-time, context-specific dynamics and variations across regions. Additionally, the findings depend on the quality and scope of the selected studies, potentially introducing bias and limiting the generalizability of the results across different post-crisis settings. For future research, it is recommended that studies focus on the long-term impact of integrated livelihood restoration programs and explore the specific factors that contribute to their success or failure. While this study offers valuable insights into the immediate benefits of these programs, it would be beneficial to examine the sustainability of the outcomes over a longer period. Additionally, more research is needed to understand the role of governance structures and institutional support in the implementation of integrated programs. Future studies should also explore the specific challenges faced by women, marginalized groups, and rural populations in accessing and benefiting from these interventions.

Acknowledgement

The author sincerely thanks all who contributed to this research. Special appreciation is extended to the academic and research institutions for their support and resources. Gratitude is also given to researchers and practitioners whose work informed this study,

as well as organizations supporting livelihood restoration. The author further acknowledges the anonymous reviewers and editorial team for their valuable feedback, which improved this article.

FUNDING STATEMENT: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not - for - profit sectors.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: The author declares no conflict of interest.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI STATEMENT: During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Turnitin in order to assist with language refinement, grammar checking, and originality verification. After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arabska, E. (2018). Farmers' markets as a business model encouraging sustainable production and consumption. *Visegrad Journal on Bioeconomy and Sustainable Development*, 7(1), 2-6.
- [2] Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Glennerster, R., & Kinnan, C. (2015). The miracle of microfinance? Evidence from a randomized evaluation. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 7(1), 22–53.
- [3] Bebbington, A. (1999). Capitals and capabilities: a framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. *World Development*, 27(12), 2021–2044.
- [4] Bhatia-Kalluri, A. (2021). *E-commerce for rural micro-entrepreneurs: Mapping restrictions, ecologies of use and trends for development*. Retrieved on December 25, 2025, from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.09759>.
- [5] Bika, Z., Subalova, M., & Locke, C. (2022). Microfinance and small business development in a transitional economy: Insights from borrowers' relations with microfinance organisations in Kazakhstan. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 58(1), 183-203.
- [6] Binaluyo, J. P., Santos, A. R., & Agustin, N. B. (2024). Challenges and opportunities for digital transformation in Philippine microfinance institutions. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 14(5), 269-280.
- [7] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- [8] Chakravarty, S., Lundberg, M., Nikolov, P., & Zenker, J. (2019). Vocational training programs and youth labor market outcomes: Evidence from Nepal. *Journal of Development Economics*, 136(1), 71–110.
- [9] Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts?: putting the first last*. London: Intermediate Technology Publication Ltd.
- [10] Chen, P., Oughton, E. J., Tyler, P., Jia, M., & Zagdanski, J. (2020). *Evaluating the impact of next generation broadband on local business creation*. Retrieved on December 20, 2025 from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.14113>.
- [11] Cooper, N., Horne, T., Hayes, G. R., Heldreth, C., Lahav, M., Holbrook, J., & Wilcox, L. (2022, April). A systematic review and thematic analysis of community-collaborative approaches to computing research. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1-18). New York: Association for Computing Machinery.
- [12] De Mel, S., McKenzie, D., & Woodruff, C. (2008). Returns to capital in microenterprises: evidence from a field experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(4), 1329–1372.
- [13] Dingsøyr, T., Moe, N. B., & Seim, E. A. (2018). Coordinating knowledge work in multiteam programs: Findings from a large-scale agile development program. *Project Management Journal*, 49(6), 64–77.
- [14] Elneel, F. A., & Almulhim, A. F. (2024). Socio-economic factors and women's empowerment: the mediation role of training/skill development. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 21(2024), 192-201.
- [15] Flick, U. (2022). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Washington DC: Sage Publishing
- [16] Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4), 245-257.
- [17] Gumede, M., & Ehiane, S. (2022). The challenges of sustainable livelihoods through land restoration in South Africa. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 57(3), 391-405.
- [18] Gupta, M. (2021). Role of NGOs in women empowerment: case studies from Uttarakhand, India. *Journal of Enterprising communities: People and places in the Global Economy*, 15(1), 26-41.

- [19] Harinurdin, E., Laksmono, B. S., Kusumastuti, R., & Safitri, K. A. (2025). Community empowerment utilizing open innovation as a sustainable village-owned enterprise strategy in Indonesia: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability*, 17(8), 3394-3405
- [20] Harrison, T. M., Guerrero, S., Burke, G. B., Cook, M., Cresswell, A., Helbig, N., ... & Pardo, T. (2011, June). Open government and e-government: Democratic challenges from a public value perspective. In *Proceedings of the 12th Annual International Digital Government Research Conference: Digital Government Innovation in Challenging Times* (pp. 245-253). New York: Association for Computing Machinery.
- [21] Hendratmi, A., Agustina, T. S., Sukmaningrum, P. S., & Widayanti, M. A. (2022). Livelihood strategies of women entrepreneurs in Indonesia. *Heliyon*, 8(9), 13-25.
- [22] Hsieh, J., Adisa, O., Bafna, S., & Zhu, H. (2023). Designing individualized policy and technology interventions to improve gig work conditions. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Symposium on Human-Computer Interaction for Work* (pp. 1-9). New York: Association for Computing Machinery.
- [23] Hughes, D. W., Brown, C., Miller, S., & McConnell, T. (2008). Evaluating the economic impact of farmers' markets using an opportunity cost framework. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 40(1), 253-265.
- [24] Hulme, D., & Mosley, P. (1996). *Finance against poverty*. London: Routledge.
- [25] Ibrahim, A. A., & Cheri, L. (2013). Democracy, political instability and the African crisis of underdevelopment. *Journal of Power, Politics & Governance*, 1(1), 91-102.
- [26] Iwuanyanwu, O., Gil-Ozoudeh, I., Okwandu, A. C., & Ike, C. S. (2024). The role of green building materials in sustainable architecture: Innovations, challenges, and future trends. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 6(8), 1935-1950.
- [27] Kannan, E., & Pohit, S. (2021). Agricultural growth diagnostics: identifying the binding constraints and policy remedies for Bihar, India. *Review of Development and Change*, 26(2), 207-225.
- [28] Karlan, D., & Valdivia, M. (2011). Teaching entrepreneurship: Impact of business training on microfinance clients and institutions. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(2), 510-527.
- [29] Kovalev, A., Stefanac, N., & Rizoiu, M.-A. (2025). *Skill-driven certification pathways: measuring industry training impact on graduate employability*. Retrieved on December 23, 2025, from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.04588>.
- [30] Kronick, D., & Rodríguez, F. (2023). Political conflict and economic growth in post-independence Venezuela. In *Roots of Underdevelopment: A New Economic and Political History of Latin America and the Caribbean* (pp. 317-346). Cham: Springer.
- [31] Kurniawan, C., Deng, X., Chakraborty, A., Gueye, A., Chen, N., & Nakahira, Y. (2022). *A learning and control perspective for microfinance*. Retrieved on December 20, 2025, from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.12631>.
- [32] Kurniawan, D., & Ramadhan, M. S. (2025). The influence of economic growth, education, and macroeconomic factors on regional poverty reduction. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 13(4), 2471-2484.
- [33] Manaf, H. A. (2017). Impact of microcredit scheme on the development of entrepreneurship skills among low income households in a developing country context. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 7(1), 583-593.
- [34] McIntosh, C., & Zeitlin, A. (2022). *Skills and liquidity barriers to youth employment: Medium-term evidence from a cash benchmarking experiment in Rwanda*. Retrieved on December 20, 2025, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.08574>.
- [35] McKenzie, D., & Woodruff, C. (2008). Experimental evidence on returns to capital and access to finance in Mexico. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 22(3), 457-482.
- [36] Moser, C., Norton, A., Conway, T., Ferguson, C., & Vizard, P. (2001). *To claim our rights: livelihood security, human rights and sustainable development*. London: Overseas Development Institute London.
- [37] Narayan, D. (2002). Bonds and bridges: social capital and poverty. *Social Capital and Economic Development: Well-Being in Developing Countries*, 4(1), 58-81.
- [38] Navapan, N., & Charoenkit, S. (2022). Local markets: how the ordinary public places can support urban sustainable development. *GMSARN Int J*, 16(1), 308-313.
- [39] Nicole, R., Alorić, A., & Sollich, P. (2021). Fragmentation in trader preferences among multiple markets: market coexistence versus single market dominance. *Royal Society Open Science*, 8(8), 202-214.
- [40] Omowole, B. M., Urefe, O., Mokogwu, C., & Ewim, S. E. (2024). Integrating fintech and innovation in microfinance: Transforming credit accessibility for small businesses. *International Journal of Frontline Research and Reviews*, 3(1), 90-100.
- [41] Parera, J. M., Nur, I. S. M., & Gobay, M. Y. (2025). The role of microloans, informal employment, and income in reducing poverty in Eastern Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 13(3), 1901-1912.
- [42] Permatasari, A. E. D., & Praswati, A. N. (2024). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation on performance mediated by innovation and network capability. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 12(1), 105-118.
- [43] Pitan, O. S., & Adedeji, S. O. (2012). Skills mismatch among university graduates in the Nigeria labor market. *US-China Education Review*, 1(1), 90-99.

- [44] Pollini, J., & Galaty, J. G. (2021). Resilience through adaptation: Innovations in Maasai livelihood strategies. *Nomadic Peoples*, 25(2), 278-311.
- [45] Pride, D., & Knoth, P. (2018). Peer review and citation data in predicting university rankings, a large-scale analysis. In *International Conference on Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries* (pp. 195-207). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- [46] Séjourné, T., Samaranayake, S., & Banerjee, S. (2018). The price of fragmentation in mobility-on-demand services. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems* (pp. 1-26). New York: Association for Computing Machinery.
- [47] Smit, B., & Wandel, J. (2006). Adaptation, adaptive capacity and vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 282-292.
- [48] Vinogradova, N., Novac, A., Jáki, E., & Aranyossy, M. (2023). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions and competencies of students in Moldova. *Society and Economy*, 45(1), 33-52.