

THE SUCCESS DETERMINANTS OF RURAL AND URBAN MICROENTERPRISES: A CASE FROM NORTH-EAST INDIA

Obed Kent¹, Khundrakpam Devananda Singh², Elangbam Nixon Singh³

Abstract

The disparities between enterprises in rural and urban areas have led to the question of determinants of success. This study assesses the success determinants of microenterprises in rural and urban areas of Northeast India. It evaluates microenterprise success (MS) using Entrepreneurial Resources (EPR), Enterprise Environment (ENE) and Enterprise Resources (ENR). A total of 210 samples in each of the rural and urban areas were collected from registered microenterprises. A quantitative approach employing t-test, Pearson correlation coefficient, ANOVA and multiple regression were used to assess the nature of the effect of EPR, ENE and ENR on microenterprise success and found a stronger percentage in urban areas than the rural areas. Further, based on individual analysis of the three variables, the finding indicates that EPR and ENR have a stronger effect in urban areas, whereas ENE has a stronger effect in rural areas, respectively. The findings of this study will be a driving force behind the determinants of microenterprise success.

Keywords: Enterprise environment, enterprise resources, entrepreneurial resources, microenterprise success, north-east India, rural and urban microenterprises

¹Department of Management, Northeast Christian University Dimapur, Nagaland, India
Email: obedkent@gmail.com

²Department of Management Nagaland University Kohima Campus, Meriema, Nagaland, India
Email: devananda@nagalanduniversity.ac.in

³Department of Management, Mizoram University Tanhril, Aizawl, Mizoram, India
Email: mzut046@mzu.edu.in *



Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Business and Information - ICBI 2025 © 2025 by [The Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka](#) is licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0.

DOI:

Introduction

The success of enterprises relies upon multiple determinants, both internally and externally. It is a collective effort of multiple stakeholders (Wang & Wang, 2024). Good cognitive capital enables entrepreneur to use their human and social resources to excel in an entrepreneurial venture (Alomani et al., 2022). In this process, an entrepreneur considers several resources to avail themselves of the benefits of entrepreneurship. Experts from diverse disciplines have distinct emphases and considerations on the issue related to the elements of entrepreneurial success (Huang, 2016). Further, the business environment and government regulations prompt a preference for certain businesses (Gunasekaran & Ngai, 2005). Therefore, the success factors have to align and stay up to date with the business environment (Mendoza et al., 2007). In addition, the quality of life in terms of economic and emotional motivation for entrepreneurs to succeed in business (Toledo-López et al., 2012). Singh (2016) opined that the availability of adequate finance, training and motivation to the enterprise owners is the determinant of microenterprise success. But the unbalanced environment between rural-urban enterprises gives rise to the question of inclusive enterprise development for both regions. With the change of time, entrepreneurs face a decline in business opportunities in rural areas (Bird & Sapp, 2004). The present study evaluates microenterprise success in rural and urban areas, incorporating resources and environmental features of such enterprises.

Literature Review

The theoretical framework of this study is based on the Resource-Based View (RBV) Theory that argues that the success of an enterprise depends on the firm's unique internal resources and capabilities (Wernerfelt, 1984). The relevant literature is reviewed in the following themes:

Entrepreneurial resources (ENR) and enterprise success

The concept of entrepreneurial resources has multifaceted views from past studies. Mosakowski (1998) defined entrepreneurial resources as creativity, foresight, intuition, and alertness of an individual about innovation and entrepreneurship among the different employees of an organisation. In addition, entrepreneurial resources with the intervention of entrepreneurs' personality traits affect entrepreneurial activity (Obschonka et al., 2012). Chen et al. (2015) reiterate the availability of information and resources to aid entrepreneurial success. Resources need to be consolidated to add value, of which entrepreneurship acts as a vital component to execute entrepreneurial resources to speed up entrepreneurial success (Huang, 2016). Likewise, access to resources creates a positive influence on business and additionally, when utilised along with complementary assets, influences the economic performance of an enterprise (Ge & Li, 2019). The ethnic social system featuring family, community and ethnic capital forms part of entrepreneurial resources; the integration of these resources produces an entrepreneurially oriented community (Dana et al., 2020). The internal capabilities through finance, information technology, and entrepreneurial orientation positively affect performance and are effective for business model innovation (Ullah et al., 2023). Entrepreneurial resources positively affect organisational management, opportunity development and self-efficacy of entrepreneurial behaviour (Sun et al., 2023). The commitment of entrepreneurs determines the level of investment in resources, which subsequently has a favourable influence on entrepreneurial performance (Wang & Wang, 2024). Entrepreneurial resources among the academicians are essential as they lead to innovativeness that aids entrepreneurship (Odetunde, 2022). However, entrepreneurial resources are insufficient at the initial stage (Ge & Li, 2019). Considering the state of importance of entrepreneurial resources, this factor is considered for the assessment of microenterprise success.

Enterprise environment (ENE) and enterprise success

Enterprises operate in a dynamic environment. The evolving business environment results in the emergence of issues and challenges for small enterprises (AlMuhayfith & Shaiti, 2020). The complex business environment necessitates high-performing firms to adopt a flexible approach (Chi et al., 2009). The ability of businesses to adapt to the evolving business landscape results in a responsive capability to consumer trends (León-gómez & López, 2023). Further, Panetto et al. (2012) stress the effect of business environment dynamism on enterprises and suggest that enterprises evaluate the compatibility of the enterprise environment to operate. The constant change in the business environment results in firms incorporating organisational design, which prompts instant feedback to the firms (Bremser & Chung, 2005). The nature of environmental dynamics necessitates a business for a differential strategy (Chi et al., 2009). Without which business experiences a significant loss of share when it faces an unfavourable environment, such as regulatory measures, substandard facilities and illegal practices (Bah & Fang, 2011). The productive growth of a business organisation relies on the environment in which it operates (Babatunde & Adebisi, 2012). The dynamism of the business environment affects product innovation in business, leading to productive performance. (Chi et al., 2009; Prajogo, 2016). The ever-changing business environment necessitates businesses to bring in techniques such as gamification to motivate individuals' performance in an organisation. (Encarnação et al., 2021). In view of the environmental complexity, businesses

pursue a strategy that considers the environmental dynamics. (Babatunde & Adebisi, 2012). Maduku et al. (2016) opined that in a business environment, there are other factors other than competitive pressure which influence the decision-making of an enterprise. The knowledge and understanding of the business environment act as a key factor in enterprise success (Adewole & Umoru, 2021). The right execution of innovation with a given environment dynamics drives enterprise development and success. (León-gómez & López, 2023). Kniecik (2024) Highlighted the constant enhancement and versatility of organisations in the evolving business environment for success over an extended period. Whereas, Shehu and Mahmood (2014) The indicated business environment has no association with business performance. However, some studies prove otherwise that the business environmental factors significantly influence the survival, growth success of a business. (Adewole & Umoru, 2021).

Therefore, there were several studies which advocate for a suitable enterprise environment. Bah and Fang (2011) examined the various dimensions of the business environment to understand business productivity and endorses a favourable business environment to facilitate business development. In line with this, this study chooses to incorporate the environmental aspect into microenterprise success.

Enterprise resources (EPR) and enterprise environment

Enterprise resources are essential elements of a business. Other elements constitute the enterprise resources, and they elevate the performance of an enterprise. Enterprise resources like human resources and technological exploration, positively affect the performance and success of enterprises (Ding et al., 202; García-Muiña & Navas-López, 2007). Similarly, a technology-driven organisation enables to development strategy leading to efficient firm performance (Benitez-Amado & Walczuch, 2012). Enterprise resources, such as information technology, explicitly affect the business process performance (Jurisch et al., 2014). It paves the way to performance and competitive advantage (Garrison et al., 2015). A business firm inculcating dynamic capabilities evades success traps and possesses adaptive capabilities (Wang et al., 2015). The resource-based advantages lead to favourable firm performance (Grimmer et al., 2017). Resources and capabilities correlate with performance in terms of efficiency and innovation (Lorenzo et al., 2018). The application of business-driven resources, like enterprise resource planning, enhances business performance (AlMuhayfith & Shaiti, 2020). Business and structural resources provide a favourable influence on enterprise success (Campbell & Kubickova, 2020). Different elements of enterprise resources contribute to the success of an enterprise with the change in pace of the business environment. In the backdrop of these dynamics, factors such as technology affect business, and the successful execution of technology elevates the efficiency (García-Muiña & Navas-López, 2007). So eventually, a business's capability and ability to review past performance and adapt to the dynamic environment lead to productive performance, leading to the generation of exceptional performance (Lorenzo et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2015).

Rural-urban areas and enterprise success

Regional features of entrepreneurship is a constant issue of concern, considering the inclusivity for development. Rural and urban areas constitute a particular business region which differs in its characteristics. Rural areas are located in the countryside, wherein agriculture and allied activities take place; whereas, urban areas are cities and towns wherein non-agricultural activities take place (Li et al., 2019). A potential threat to rural and urban economies estranged with the rise in urbanisation (Mayer et al., 2016). In light of this, entrepreneurs comprehending the entrepreneurial dynamics in urban and rural areas offer caution to the policy makers (Freire- Gibb & Nielsen, 2014). Specifically, rural areas encounter the threat of human talent in particular due to other advanced regions (Huggins et al., 2017). Hence, rural entrepreneurs deliberately use rural-urban linkages to add value to the traditional rural asset (Mayer et al., 2016). Rural enterprises need external assistance as it is constrained by environmental factors (Musunguzi et al., 2023), and should possess qualities such as resilience, risk awareness, non-conforming and self-belief (Iwara et al., 2021). Business survival in the peripheral region relies on the support of growth motivation, human capital and locational factors (Huggins et al., 2017). In the context of the urban set-up, the scenario is relatively alike. The urban system of innovation, considering the presence of assets in the form of its location, diverse city resident facilitates business success (Markatou & Alexandrou, 2015). Enterprises in the city lead to job creation and an increase in household income (Drbie & Kassahun, 2013). In addition, innovation results from the entrepreneur's self-employment in urban areas (Faggio & Silva, 2014). Urban areas avail the benefits of infrastructure, factors of production, and growth (Markatou & Alexandrou, 2015). Further, entrepreneurial capacity such as infrastructure, risk taking, and innovation, is are factors that influence enterprise success in peri-urban areas (Mmbengwa et al., 2013). Again, enterprise in peri-urban areas depends on the quality of products, customer relationships, the motivation and creativity (Sroka et al., 2023). Paul & Shahiduzzaman (2024) highlighted that Government initiatives and training are important for enterprise development in North-East India. From the literature review, it is acknowledged that earlier studies have overlooked the various determinants of microenterprise success in the rural and urban context of North-East India.

Against this backdrop, the diverse perspectives of the EPR, ENE and ENR are considered to assess microenterprise success in rural and urban areas in North-East India. To achieve the given purpose, three hypotheses were framed to assess the influence of EPR, ENE, and ENR on microenterprise success in rural and urban settings. The formulated hypotheses are as follows:

H1: There is a significant effect of EPR on microenterprise success between rural and urban areas.

H2: There is a significant effect of ENE on microenterprise success between rural and urban areas

H3: There is a significant effect of ENR microenterprise success between rural and urban areas.

Research Methodology

The study aimed to evaluate the microenterprise success in rural and urban areas in Nagaland, one of the states in North-East India, considering EPR, ENE and ENR, respectively. Dimapur and Kohima districts of the state, which are the main business hubs in Nagaland, were considered. The registered microenterprises that have existed for a minimum of five years on the day of data collection were considered for the study. In this regard, the number of microenterprises was 247 and 244 in rural and urban areas, respectively, existed. A set of questions was prepared based on the determinants of microenterprise success drawn from the literature review. Informed consent was given by all the respondents, and their participation was voluntary. A pilot study was conducted for schedule finalisation, and data were collected through the well-structured Five-Point Likert Scale schedule. Only 210 valid responses, each from both rural and urban areas, were collected, having a total sample of 420 respondents. The secondary data were collected from the Statistical Handbooks of Nagaland. Purposive sampling method was adopted for data collection, and the analyses have adopted Cronbach's alpha, independent sample t-test, Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple regression.

Findings and Discussion

Reliability assessment

Before administering any statistical tool to analyse the collected data, Cronbach's alpha reliability test was conducted and the overall alpha value is measured at .868, whereas the alpha values of EPR, ENE and ENR (independent variables) are measured at .870, .829 and .878, respectively, indicating that the items in the schedule are highly correlated and that the scale is reliable. The items under microenterprise success (dependent variable) are fewer, and the alpha value is measured at .680, which is also accepted. Then, the appropriate tests were administered to analyse the data.

Independent sample test

An independent sample t-test was carried out to assess the hypotheses of the study. It compares the rural and urban microenterprises in terms of their success. The study endeavours to compare the effect of the variables, namely EPR, ENE, and ENR, on microenterprises' success between the rural and urban areas. An independent sample t-test analyses the effect of the given variables on micro-enterprise success in rural and urban areas. Firstly, the effect of EPR on microenterprise success in rural and urban areas was conducted, wherein the output indicated a significant difference with $t(418) = 3.488$, $p = 0.001$. The mean score for the rural area ($M = 1.785$, $SD = .086$) was lower than the urban area ($M = 1.819$, $SD = .110$). The mean difference between the two areas with (mean difference = .033, 95 per cent CI = .014 to .052) was significant. Hence, H1 was supported, which states, there is a significant effect of EPR on microenterprise success between rural and urban areas. The result suggests EPR do influence microenterprise success in both rural and urban areas. However, the influence of EPR on microenterprise success is stronger in urban areas. Secondly, the effect of ENE on microenterprise success in rural and urban areas revealed a significant difference. The t-test result was significant with $t(418) = 2.730$, $p = 0.007$. The meaning of ENE for rural ($M = 3.223$, $SD = .329$) is higher than the urban area ($M = 3.131$, $SD = .361$). The extent of the mean difference between the rural and urban states stood at (mean difference = -.09219, 95 per cent CI = .158 to .02581) and was significant. Therefore, H2 was supported as there is a significant effect of ENE on microenterprise success in rural and urban areas. The result affirms ENE influences microenterprise success both in rural and urban areas. The influence of ENE on micro enterprise success is stronger in rural areas than in urban areas. Thirdly, the t-test compares the effect of ENR on microenterprise success in rural and urban areas. There was a significant difference with $t(418) = 5.258$, $p < 0.001$. The mean score for the rural area ($M = 1.530$, $SD = .031$) is lower than the urban area ($M = 1.549$, $SD = .041$). The mean difference = .01895, 95 per cent CI = .01186 to .02603 was significant. Accordingly, H3 was supported, which means that there is a significant effect of ENR on microenterprise success in rural and urban areas. The result suggests the influence of ENR on micro-enterprise success in both rural and urban areas. However, the influence of ENR on microenterprise success is stronger in urban areas than the rural areas.

Correlation analysis on microenterprise success

The hypothesis test presents the difference in the effect of the variables under consideration on microenterprise success. This section further delves into the strength of the relationship between EPR, ENE and EPR on microenterprise success in rural and urban areas. The study applied the Pearson correlation coefficient to draw the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. As a result of the analysis, regarding the microenterprises in rural areas, EPR and microenterprise success have a strong positive and statistically significant correlation ($r = .747$, $p < .001$). Hence, an increase in entrepreneurial resources would lead to an increase in microenterprise success in rural areas. Similarly, EPR and microenterprise success in urban areas have a very strong positive and statistically significant relation ($r = .818$, $p < .001$). This indicates that with an increase in entrepreneurial resources, it would result in an increase in microenterprise success in urban areas. Further, the relationship of ENE with microenterprise success in rural areas indicated strong positive and statistically significant relations ($r = .735$, $p < .001$). The result implies that with an increase in ENE, there would be an increase in Microenterprise Success. Likewise, there was a strong positive and statistically significant result with ($r = .604$, $p < .001$). This shows that with an increase in ENE, it would lead to an increase in microenterprise success. Again, the relation between ENR and microenterprise success was examined for the rural area. The result shows a strong positive and statistically significant outcome ($r = .671$, $p < .001$). The result signifies that with increase in ENR paves the way for an increase in microenterprise success. Conversely, for urban areas, ENR and microenterprise success have a strong positive and statistically significant result ($r = .763$, $p < .001$). The output shows that the increase in ENR leads to microenterprise success.

Multiple regression

For rural enterprises

After the correlation analysis, EPR, ENE, and EPR were further analysed in relation to microenterprise success in rural and urban areas. Two separate regression analyses on rural and urban areas, respectively, were performed to get insights into the explanatory power of the predictors on microenterprise success. As a result of regression analysis, the independent variables, namely EPR, ENE and ENR, with $F = 197.199$, $p < 0.001$, collectively have a significant influence on microenterprise success in rural areas. Further, the $R^2 = .742$ indicates that the EPR, ENE, and ENR explain 74.2 per cent of the variance in microenterprise success. Individual regression analysis of EPR [Beta (B) = 1.301, $t = 10.533$, $p < 0.001$], ENE (B = .297, $t = 8.188$, $p < 0.001$), ENR (B = 1.268, $t = 10.533$, $p = 0.001$) each has a significant and positive influence on microenterprise success in the rural setup.

For urban enterprises

Again, for the microenterprises in urban areas, the independent variables, namely EPR, ENE and ENR, with $F = 650.155$, $p < 0.001$, collectively have a significant influence on microenterprise success for rural areas. Further, the $R^2 = .904$ indicates that the EPR, ENE, and ENR explain 90.4 per cent of the variance in microenterprise success. Individual regression of EPR (B = 1.480, $t = 20.219$, $p < 0.001$), ENE (B = .276, $t = 13.760$, $p < 0.001$), and ENR (B = 2.812, $t = 14.201$, $p = 0.001$) each have a significant and positive influence on microenterprise success in the rural setup.

Conclusion

The study aimed to evaluate the microenterprise success in rural and urban areas, considering the factors, namely EPR, ENE and ENR. The result disclosed the influence of EPR, ENE and ENR towards microenterprise success in rural and urban areas. This finding is aligned with the findings of Alom, Abdullah, Moten & Azam (2016). These factors collectively and individually contribute to microenterprise success in rural and urban areas. The study indicates that EPR, ENE and ENR together account for a very high influence on microenterprise success in urban areas. Individually, the resource factor, i.e. EPR and ENR, exerts a stronger influence in urban areas, whereas ENE has a stronger influence in rural areas. The results provide a valuable insight into the significance of resource-based and environmental factors in rural and urban-based microenterprise success. The study reaffirms the necessity of entrepreneurial and enterprise resources of urban-based microenterprises. Further, it sheds light on the significance of environmental aspects on microenterprise success in rural areas. It indicated that the rural-based microenterprises rely on the friendly business environment to excel.

The study provides insights into the influence of resources and environmental features on microenterprise success. It paves a way for future research for a depth enquiry into environmental factors in the rural setup. This would channel a way for further knowledge on rural entrepreneurship. The findings reveal the significance of resources and environmental aspects on entrepreneurship. Policy makers and entrepreneurs could consider entrepreneurial resources, enterprise environment and enterprise resources in their agenda for entrepreneurship development and enterprise success. The concern could take into consideration the suitable environmental factors for rural

entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial & enterprise resources for the urban enterprises. It would benefit the micro-level entrepreneurs for sustainable business. The paper is limited to the rural and urban microenterprises in two districts of a state in North-East India. More districts and states can be considered in future research for better generalisation of findings.

References

- Adewole, E. G., & Umoru, T. A. (2021). Perceived influence of business environment on small and medium-scale enterprises success in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 6(6), 195–200. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.6.1182>
- AlMuhayfith, S., & Shaiti, H. (2020). The impact of enterprise resource planning on business performance: With the discussion on its relationship with open innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(3), 87. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6030087>
- Alom, F., Abdullah, M. A., Moten, A. R., & Azam, S. M. F. (2016). Success factors of overall improvement of microenterprises in Malaysia: An empirical study. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-016-0050-2>
- Alomani, A., Baptista, R., & Athreye, S. S. (2022). The interplay between human, social and cognitive resources of nascent entrepreneurs. *Small Business Economics*, 59(4), 1301–1326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00580-8>
- Babatunde, B. O., & Adebisi, A. O. (2012). Strategic environmental scanning and organisation performance in a competitive business environment. *Economic Insights – Trends and Challenges*, 64(1), 24–34.
- Bah, E., & Fang, L. (2011). Impact of the business environment on output and productivity in Africa. *Journal of Development Economics*, 114, 159–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2015.01.001>
- Benitez-Amado, J., & Walczuch, R. M. (2012). Information technology, the organisational capability of proactive corporate environmental strategy and firm performance: A resource-based analysis. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 21(6), 664–679. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2012.14>
- Bird, S. R., & Sapp, S. G. (2004). Understanding the gender gap in small business success: Urban and rural comparisons. *Gender and Society*, 18(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243203259129>
- Bremser, W. G., & Chung, Q. B. (2005). A framework for performance measurement in the e-business environment. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 4(4), 395–412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2005.07.001>
- Campbell, J. M., & Kubickova, M. (2020). Agritourism microbusinesses within a developing country economy: A resource-based view. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 17, 100460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100460>
- Chen, M. H., Chang, Y. Y., & Lee, C. Y. (2015). Creative entrepreneurs' guanxi networks and success: Information and resource. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(4), 900–905. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.11.049>
- Chi, T., Kilduff, P. P. D., & Gargeya, V. B. (2009). Alignment between business environment characteristics, competitive priorities, supply chain structures, and firm business performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 58(7), 645–669. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410400910989467>
- Dana, L. P., Gurau, C., Light, I., & Muhammad, N. (2020). Family, community, and ethnic capital as entrepreneurial resources: Toward an integrated model. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 58(5), 1003–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12507>
- Ding, H., Vorobjovas-Pinta, O., & Grimmer, L. (2021). Identifying firm resources and capabilities for successful export: The case of regional SME premium food producers. *Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing*, 33(4), 374–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974438.2020.1808553>
- Drbie, M., & Kassahun, T. (2013). Deterrents to the success of micro and small enterprises in Akaki-Kality sub-city. *Journal of Business and Administrative Studies*, 5(2), 1–33.
- Encarnação, R., Reuter, J., Ferreira Dias, M., & Amorim, M. (2021). Gamification as a driver of motivation in organisations: A bibliometric literature review. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Technological Ecosystems for Enhancing Multiculturality (TEEM'21)* (pp. 167–172). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3486011.3486440>

- Faggio, G., & Silva, O. (2014). Self-employment and entrepreneurship in urban and rural labour markets. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 84, 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2014.09.001>
- Freire-Gibb, L. C., & Nielsen, K. (2014). Entrepreneurship within urban and rural areas: Creative people and social networks. *Regional Studies*, 48(1), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2013.808322>
- García-Muiña, F. E., & Navas-López, J. E. (2007). Explaining and measuring success in new business: The effect of technological capabilities on firm results. *Technovation*, 27, 30–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2006.04.004>
- Garrison, G., Wakefield, R. L., & Kim, S. (2015). The effects of IT capabilities and delivery model on cloud computing success and firm performance for cloud supported processes and operations. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(4), 377–393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2015.03.001>
- Ge, J., & Li, T. (2019). Entrepreneurial resources, complementary assets, and platform sustainability. *Sustainability*, 11(16), 4359. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11164359>
- Grimmer, L., Miles, M. P., Byrom, J., & Grimmer, M. (2017). The impact of resources and strategic orientation on small retail firm performance. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55(S1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12368>
- Gunasekaran, A., & Ngai, E. W. T. (2005). Build-to-order supply chain management: A literature review and framework for development. *Journal of Operations Management*, 23(5), 423–451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2004.10.005>
- Huang, H. C. (2016). Entrepreneurial resources and speed of entrepreneurial success in an emerging market: The moderating effect of entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-014-0321-8>
- Huggins, R., Prokop, D., & Thompson, P. (2017). Entrepreneurship and the determinants of firm survival within regions: Human capital, growth motivation and locational conditions. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 29(3–4), 357–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2016.1271830>
- Iwara, I. O., Kilonzo, B. M., Zuwarimwe, J., & Netshandama, V. O. (2021). Entrepreneurs' endogenous attributes necessary for small enterprise success in Vhembe rural areas, South Africa. *Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 13(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajesbm.v13i1.331>
- Jurisch, M. C., Palka, W., Wolf, P., & Krcmar, H. (2014). Which capabilities matter for successful business process change? *Business Process Management Journal*, 20(1), 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.1108/bpmj-11-2012-0125>
- Kmiecik, M. (2024). Supply and demand prediction by 3PL for assortment planning. *Management Science Letters*, 15(2), 97–112. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2024.5.001>
- León-Gómez, A., & López, S. J. (2023). Innovation and transformation: Keys to the success of SMEs in the digital age. *Journal of Economics, Innovative Management, and Entrepreneurship*, 2(3), 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.59652/jeime.v2i3.253>
- Li, Y., Westlund, H., & Liu, Y. (2019). Why some rural areas decline while some others not: An overview of rural evolution in the world. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 68, 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2019.03.003>
- Lorenzo, J. R. F., Rubio, M. T. M., & Garcés, S. A. (2018). The competitive advantage in business, capabilities and strategy: What general performance factors are found in the Spanish wine industry? *Wine Economics and Policy*, 7(2), 94–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wep.2018.04.001>
- Maduku, D. K., Mpinganjira, M., & Duh, H. (2016). Understanding mobile marketing adoption intention by South African SMEs: A multi-perspective framework. *International Journal of Information Management*, 36(5), 711–723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.04.018>
- Markatou, M., & Alexandrou, E. (2015). Urban system of innovation: Main agents and main factors of success. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 195, 240–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.355>
- Mayer, H., Habersetzer, A., & Meili, R. (2016). Rural-urban linkages and sustainable regional development: The role of entrepreneurs in linking peripheries and centers. *Sustainability*, 8(8), 745. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8080745>

- Mendoza, L. E., Marius, A., Pérez, M., & Grimán, A. C. (2007). Critical success factors for a customer relationship management strategy. *Information and Software Technology*, 49(8), 913–945. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2006.10.003>
- Mmbengwa, V. M., Groenewald, J. A., & Van Schalkwyk, H. D. (2013). Evaluation of the entrepreneurial success factors of small, micro and medium farming enterprises (SMMEs) in the peri-urban poor communities of George municipality, Western Cape Province, RSA. *African Journal of Business Management*, 7(30), 2996–3012. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM12.1102>
- Mosakowski, E. (1998). Entrepreneurial resources, organizational choices, and competitive outcomes. *Organisation Science*, 9(6), 625–643. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.9.6.625>
- Musinguzi, P., Baker, D., & Villano, R. A. (2023). Interrelationships amongst critical success factors and rural social enterprises' performance in a developing country context. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 100, 102995. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2023.03.003>
- Nwachukwu, C., & Chladkova, H. (2019). Firm resources, strategic analysis capability and strategic performance: Organisational structure as moderator. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 13(1), 75–94. <https://doi.org/10.24874/IJQR13.01-05>
- Obschonka, M., Silbereisen, R. K., & Schmitt-Rodermund, E. (2012). Explaining entrepreneurial behaviour: Dispositional personality traits, growth of personal entrepreneurial resources, and business idea generation. *Career Development Quarterly*, 60(2), 178–190. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2012.00015.x>
- Odetunde, O. J. (2022). Entrepreneurial resources and engagement of African academics: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Entrepreneurial Innovations*, 3(1), 28–42. <https://doi.org/10.14426/jei.v3i1.1232>
- Panetto, H., Goncalves, R., & Molina, A. (2012). Enterprise integration and networking: Theory and practice. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 36(2), 284–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2012.09.009>
- Paul, A. K., & Shahiduzzaman, A. S. M. (2024). A study on small and medium enterprise growth in North East India. *Shikshan Sanshodhan: Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(7), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.2018/SS/202407009>
- Shehu, A. M., & Mahmood, R. (2014). Influence of entrepreneurial orientation and business environment on small and medium firm performance: A PLS approach. *Advances in Management & Applied Economics*, 4(4), 101–114.
- Singh, K. D. (2016). Determinants of micro-enterprise development in North-Eastern Region of India: Evidences from Imphal West District of Manipur. *Journal of Rural Development*, 35(2), 191–209.
- Sroka, W., Sulewski, P., Mikolajczyk, J., & Król, K. (2023). Farming under urban pressure: Business models and success factors of peri-urban farms. *Agriculture*, 13(6), 1216. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture13061216>
- Sun, J., Zhao, Y., Wu, S., & Zhou, Y. (2023). How entrepreneurial self-efficacy promotes part-time entrepreneurial behavior: The moderating role of entrepreneurial resources. *Sustainability*, 15(17), 13058. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151713058>
- Toledo-López, A., Díaz-Pichardo, R., Jiménez-Castañeda, J. C., & Sánchez-Medina, P. S. (2012). Defining success in subsistence businesses. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(12), 1658–1664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.006>
- Ullah, R., Anwar, M., & Khattak, M. S. (2023). Building new venture success through internal capabilities: Is business model innovation a missing link? *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 35(11), 1453–1466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2021.2010696>
- Wang, C. L., Senaratne, C., & Rafiq, M. (2015). Success traps, dynamic capabilities and firm performance. *British Journal of Management*, 26(1), 26–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12066>
- Wang, J., & Wang, X. (2024). The price of success: Balancing the effects of entrepreneurial commitment, work–family conflict on entrepreneurial performance. *SAGE Open*, 14(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241261754>
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050207>