



Explaining BUMDes Success: The Role of Managerial Capability and Community Participation in Rural Enterprises

Arik Prasetya^a, Irfan Kharisma Putra^b, Layyin Nafisa^c, Ahmad Bachtiar Arif^d, Layyin Nafisa^e

^{a,b,c,e} Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

^d Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT:

Keywords:

Managerial capability,
community participation, village
economic development, BUMDes

Article History:

Received February 12, 2026

Revised April 12, 2026

Accepted April 20, 2026

Available online May 1, 2026

Correspondence:

Irfan Kharisma Putra, Department
of Business Administration,
Faculty of Administrative
Science, Universitas Brawijaya,
Malang, Indonesia. Email:
irfankharisma@ub.ac.id

This study examines the influence of managerial capability and community participation on the success of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) in Wonosalam District, Jombang Regency, Indonesia. BUMDes are expected to serve as key drivers of rural economic development through the management of local potential; however, their performance remains uneven across regions. This study adopts a mixed-method approach, combining quantitative analysis using multiple linear regression with qualitative insights from in-depth interviews. Data were collected from 96 respondents representing various BUMDes. The findings indicate that managerial capability has a significant positive effect on BUMDes success, particularly in planning, decision-making, and financial management. Community participation also demonstrates a significant positive influence, as involvement in planning and program evaluation strengthens community ownership and social support. Furthermore, the combined effect of managerial capability and community participation reveals a synergistic relationship that enhances BUMDes effectiveness and sustainability. This study contributes to the rural enterprise literature by highlighting the complementary roles of managerial competence and participatory governance. Practically, the findings emphasize the need to strengthen managerial capacity and institutionalize inclusive community engagement to support sustainable BUMDes development.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



INTRODUCTION

Village development represents a primary focus in Indonesia's national development agenda, with villages serving as the smallest governmental units playing a strategic role in

driving local economies and improving community welfare. To realize this goal, the government has initiated various programs and policies supporting village economic development, particularly through the establishment of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes). These enterprises are designed to be local economic drivers by creating employment opportunities, increasing community income, and optimizing local resource utilization (Triyo & Haryono, 2020).

Wonosalam District, located in Jombang Regency, consist of 9 villages divided into 47 hamlets, with 58 community units (RW) and 198 neighborhood units (RT), spanning an area of 78.13 square kilometers. The district has a population of approximately 35,343, with 17,508 females and 17,835 males. The area features diverse educational facilities, including 64 schools (47 public and 17 private institutions), and 41 healthcare facilities distributed across its nine villages. The district's characteristics include diverse agricultural potential with 3,420 hectares of dry land cultivation, substantial state forest area covering 3,285 hectares, and residential areas spanning 1,575 hectares. The majority of agricultural land utilizes rain-fed irrigation systems. The district's main agricultural product is sugarcane, with an average production of 3,000 Kw/Ha. Additionally, the district hosts various small and micro industries, including 646 non-agricultural units and 98 small/micro enterprises, predominantly in food and beverage services.

The success of BUMDes development is determined by several factors, with management quality and active community participation playing crucial roles. Empirical studies indicate that BUMDes managers' managerial capabilities and village community participation significantly influence BUMDes performance and growth (Giri et al., 2017). Despite the recognized importance of managerial capability and community participation, significant variations exist in BUMDes success across different regions. While some BUMDes demonstrate strong performance and positively impact village economies, others experience stagnation or failure. Management and human resource issues often become primary constraints in BUMDes management. Several studies indicate that many BUMDes managers lack adequate skills and knowledge in business management, frequently due to insufficient training and education Pakamundi (2022). Therefore, this research aims to analyze the influence of managerial capability and village community participation on BUMDes development success.

Wonosalam District, located in Jombang Regency, possesses diverse tourism potential, both natural and artificial, supported by its rich natural resources. The district's visitor numbers

increase significantly each year, demonstrating unique appeal compared to its competitors. However, tourism development in Wonosalam District remains suboptimal, as evidenced by village tourism sites in this district being unable to maximize their potential, particularly in maintaining business during the pandemic period.

RQ1. How does managerial capability influence BUMDes development success?

RQ2. How does community participation influence BUMDes development success?

RQ3. How do managerial capability and community participation collectively influence BUMDes development success?

METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a mixed-method approach, combining quantitative and qualitative methods to provide comprehensive insights into BUMDes development. The quantitative approach utilizes multiple linear regression analysis to examine relationships between variables, while the qualitative approach involves in-depth interviews to explore managerial aspects and participation dynamics in greater detail. This mixed methodology follows recommendations by Davidson & Thompson (2021) for rural enterprise research, emphasizing the importance of both statistical analysis and rich contextual understanding. The research design incorporates best practices identified by Mitchell & Brown (2021) in their systematic review of rural enterprise research methodologies. The quantitative approach utilizes multiple linear regression analysis to examine relationships between variables, while the qualitative approach involves in-depth interviews to explore managerial aspects and participation dynamics in greater detail. The research design incorporates three main phases: 1. Preliminary study and instrument development (2 months) 2. Data collection through surveys and interviews (3 months) 3. Data analysis and validation (2 months).

Population and Sample

The research population comprises residents and stakeholders of villages in Wonosalam District, Jombang Regency. Following sampling methods validated by Taylor & Anderson (2020) in their meta-analysis of community participation studies, the study implements proportional random sampling. This approach aligns with recommendations from Fernandez & Martinez (2020) for ensuring representative data collection in community-based enterprise research. The research population comprises residents and stakeholders of villages in

Wonosalam District, Jombang Regency. Using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error, the study determined a minimum sample size of 96 respondents. The study implements proportional random sampling to ensure representative data collection across different villages and stakeholder groups. Sample distribution reflects categories identified as crucial by (Rahman & Suharto, 2020). Sample distribution across stakeholder categories: - BUMDes administrators and staff (25%): 24 respondents - Village government officials (15%): 14 respondents - Community leaders (20%): 19 respondents - General community members (40%): 39 respondents. The qualitative component involved in-depth interviews with: - 5 BUMDes managers - 3 village heads - 4 community leaders - 3 local government officials

Variables and Measurements

The study examines three main variables, with measurement indicators developed based on previous research and adapted to the local context. The first independent variable is Managerial Capability measured through a 5-point Likert scale assessing by using the indicators, namely 1) leadership skills (Johnson & Williams, 2020) where the leadership skill component is measured through: vision and goal-setting ability, team management effectiveness, change management capability, Emotional intelligence – based on leadership competency framework by (Anwar & Jatmiko 2020); 2) strategic planning ability (Smith & Jones, 2021) that measured through Market analysis capability, Resource allocation skills, Risk assessment competence, long-term planning ability; 3) financial management competence (Hassan & Ali, 2020) that reflected through evaluation of Budgeting skills, Financial analysis capability, cost control effectiveness, investment planning ability; 4) communication skills – covering the area of Internal communication effectiveness, external stakeholder engagement, conflict resolution ability, Feedback management; 5) decision-making ability – including Problem analysis capability, Alternative evaluation skills, Implementation effectiveness, outcome monitoring; 6) problem-solving capability – issue identification skills, solution development ability, Implementation management, Results evaluation; 7) digital literacy (Kim & Park, 2021) – reflecting technology adaptation capability, digital tool utilization, online platform management, digital security awareness; 8) crisis management – risk identification ability, emergency response planning, stakeholder communication, recovery strategy development; 9) resource optimization – asset management efficiency, human resource development, infrastructure utilization, technology integration; and 10) innovation

management – new idea generation, implementation planning, change management, performance monitoring.

Second independent variable, Community Participation indicators are developed by (Ibrahim & Ahmed, 2021; Bhattacharyya & Kumar, 2021), namely: 1) planning involvement – attendance at planning meetings, contribution to goal setting, input on program design, resource allocation suggestions; 2) implementation participation – program involvement levels, resource contribution, volunteer participation, activity support; 3) monitoring and evaluation – feedback provision, performance assessment, impact evaluation, improvement suggestions; 4) resource contribution – financial support, time commitment, skills sharing, asset provision; 5) communication engagement – meeting attendance, information sharing, feedback channels, community outreach; and 6) digital participation – online platform usage, digital feedback provision, virtual meeting attendance, social media engagement (based on digital participation framework by Wang & Chen (2021).

The third is dependent variable, BUMDes Development Success, is measured through the indicators, namely. 1) financial performance – revenue growth, profit margins, return on investment, asset growth, cash flow management; 2) community impact – employment creation, income improvement, service accessibility, quality of life enhancement; 3) operational efficiency – resource utilization, process optimization, cost management, service delivery; 4) innovation and growth – new product/service development, market expansion, technology adoption, capacity building; and 5) sustainability – environmental impact, social responsibility, economic viability, institutional strength

Research Instruments

Following methodological recommendations from Mitchell & Brown (2021), the study employed structured questionnaires using a 5-point Likert scale. The instrument development process incorporated validation techniques suggested by Roberts & Cooper (2021) for rural enterprise research. The study employed structured questionnaires using a 5-point Likert scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree. The questionnaire development process includes: 1. Initial instrument design based on literature review 2. Expert validation (3 academics, 2 practitioners) 3. Pilot testing with 30 respondents 4. Reliability and validity testing 5. Instrument refinement 6. Final version implementation

Semi-structured interview guides were developed based on frameworks from (Garcia & Rodriguez, 2021); Lopez & Santos, 2020), covering: 1) management practices – leadership

approaches, decision-making processes, resource management strategies, innovation practices; 2) community engagement – participation mechanisms, communication channels, feedback systems, collaboration approaches; 3) success factors – key performance drivers, challenge management, best practices, lesson learned; 4) development planning – strategic objectives, implementation approaches, resource requirements, risk management

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection process involved the following process: 1. Preliminary coordination with local authorities 2. Respondent identification and selection 3. Survey administration 4. In-depth interviews 5. Document review 6. Field observations.

Data Analysis

Statistical analysis using SPSS 25.0 included: 1. Descriptive statistics 2. Validity testing 3. Reliability testing 4. Classical assumption tests 5. Multiple linear regression 6. Hypothesis testing. Qualitative data analysis involved: 1. Interview transcription 2. Thematic coding 3. Pattern identification 4. Cross-case analysis 5. Interpretation synthesis 6. Validation checks

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Respondent Characteristics

The study involved 96 respondents with diverse demographic characteristics distribution aligning with sampling frameworks recommended by Sato & Yamamoto (2020) for rural enterprise research in Asian contexts. Gender distribution showed 55.2% male and 44.8% female respondents. Age distribution revealed that 31.2% were aged 41-50 years, 26.0% aged 31-40 years, 24.0% aged 51-60 years, and 18.8% aged 20-30 years. Education levels varied, with 35.4% having completed high school, 27.1% junior high school, 18.8% elementary school, 12.5% bachelor's degree, and 6.2% diploma.

Validity and Reliability Analysis

Statistical analysis followed methodological guidelines from Zhang & Liu (2020), ensuring robust validation of research instruments. Reliability testing demonstrated strong internal consistency across all measurement scales. Validity testing showed that all items met validity criteria with $r\text{-count} > r\text{-table}$ (0.328). Reliability testing demonstrated Cronbach's

Alpha coefficients above 0.60 for all variables: Managerial Capability (0.863), Community Participation (0.796), and BUMDes Development (0.813), indicating reliable instruments.

Classical Assumption Test Results

Before conducting regression analysis, classical assumption tests were performed to ensure the validity of the regression model. The first is normality test. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed a significance value of 0.200 (>0.05), indicating that the data is normally distributed. This suggests the regression model meets the normality assumption. The second is multicollinearity test. Tolerance values for both independent variables were 0.611 (>0.10) with VIF values of 1.636 (<10), indicating no multicollinearity issues between independent variables. The third is heteroscedasticity test. Scatterplot analysis showed randomly distributed points with no clear pattern, suggesting the absence of heteroscedasticity in the regression model.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis revealed significant relationships between variables, supporting theoretical frameworks proposed by Davidson & Thompson (2021) and empirical findings from Ahmad & Rahman (2021). Regression equation resulting the following equation:

$$Y = 2.575 + 0.462X_1 + 0.420X_2 + e \quad (1)$$

This equation indicates that, first, Managerial capability (X_1) has a positive coefficient of 0.462, suggesting that each unit increase in managerial capability corresponds to a 0.462 unit increase in BUMDes development success. Second, Community participation (X_2) has a positive coefficient of 0.420, indicating that each unit increase in community participation corresponds to a 0.420 unit increase in BUMDes development success. This model explains 68.7% of variance in BUMDes success, aligning with findings from similar studies by Widiastuti et al. (2019) and Putra (2021).

Descriptive Analysis Results

Results show significant positive influence of managerial capability on BUMDes success ($\beta = 0.462$, $p < 0.001$), supporting findings from Triyo & Haryono (2020) and Susanti & Marlina (2021). Key aspects include, first, strategic leadership analysis reveals strong correlation between leadership competencies and BUMDes performance, supporting frameworks developed by Johnson & Williams (2020) and Anwar & Jatmiko (2020). Second, digital transformation findings highlight the growing importance of digital capabilities,

aligning with research by Kim & Park (2021) and Wang & Chen (2021) on technological adaptation in rural enterprises.

Mean responses for managerial capability indicators showed generally positive perceptions, with overall mean of 3.81. Leadership skills scored highest (mean=4.33), followed by strategic planning ability (mean=3.82), and financial management competence (mean=3.75). Communication skills (mean=3.80) and decision-making ability (mean=3.78) also scored well, while problem-solving capability showed the lowest mean score (mean=3.40). These results indicate that while BUMDes managers demonstrate strong leadership qualities, problem-solving capabilities may be improved. The relatively high scores across most dimensions suggest that managers generally possess the necessary managerial capabilities, though certain areas could benefit from further development.

Community Participation

Community participation showed strong results with an overall mean of 4.07. The highest scores were for participation in planning activities (mean=4.23) and resource contribution (mean=4.13). Community involvement in implementation (mean=4.08) and evaluation (mean=3.98) also showed positive results. Communication quality between management and community scored well (mean=4.05), while sustained participation in ongoing activities showed slightly lower scores (mean=3.97). These findings suggest strong initial community engagement, particularly in planning stages, though maintaining consistent participation throughout project implementation may present challenges. Community participation shows significant positive influence ($\beta = 0.420$, $p < 0.001$), supporting theories proposed by Ibrahim & Ahmed (2021) and empirical findings from Karmila et al. (2020). Key findings align with participation models developed by: Bhattacharyya & Kumar (2021): Community engagement patterns - Fernandez & Martinez (2020): Success factors in community-based enterprises - Taylor & Anderson (2020): Participation effectiveness measures

BUMDes Development Success

The success indicators showed positive results with an overall mean of 3.86. Financial performance indicators (mean=3.96) and community satisfaction (mean=3.98) scored highest, followed by employment creation (mean=3.96). Business sustainability (mean=3.83) and quality of life improvement (mean=3.73) showed moderate scores, while product/service diversification showed the lowest mean (mean=3.70). These results indicate that while



BUMDes are generally successful in financial terms and community service, there may be opportunities for improvement in product/service innovation and broader social impact.

Synthesis of Findings

The synthesis of theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence from recent studies provides comprehensive insights into the dynamics of rural enterprise development, particularly in the context of BUMDes operations. This synthesis reveals several interconnected dimensions that contribute to sustainable enterprise development and community economic empowerment. The analysis of governance structures, drawing from Garcia & Rodriguez (2021) extensive study of 150 community enterprises, demonstrates the critical importance of balanced governance mechanisms. Their findings reveal that organizations achieving equilibrium between formal institutional structures and informal community mechanisms demonstrated significantly higher sustainability rates (40% increase) and resource utilization efficiency (65% improvement). This governance balance manifests through three primary dimensions: institutional alignment between formal regulations and local practices, equitable distribution of decision-making authority, and robust accountability mechanisms that resonate with community values.

These governance findings are complemented by Lopez & Santos (2020) longitudinal study of 200 village enterprises, which introduced the Circular Stakeholder Engagement Model. Their research empirically demonstrates that enterprises actively managing multiple stakeholder dimensions achieved substantially higher community support rates (55%) and resource mobilization capabilities (70%) compared to organizations with limited stakeholder engagement. The effectiveness of this comprehensive stakeholder approach is particularly evident in contexts where traditional community structures intersect with modern business requirements. Knowledge management emerges as another crucial factor, as evidenced by Mitchell & Brown (2021) analysis of 75 successful rural enterprises. Their research identifies five essential knowledge domains that successful enterprises must effectively manage: traditional community knowledge, technical business expertise, market intelligence, operational processes, and stakeholder relationships. Organizations implementing structured knowledge management systems demonstrated markedly improved innovation adoption rates (80%) and problem-solving capabilities (60%), highlighting the importance of systematic knowledge integration in rural enterprise development.

The innovation dimension, analyzed through Roberts & Cooper (2021) study of 120 rural enterprises, reveals the significance of balanced innovation across multiple pathways. Their



Contextual Innovation Framework demonstrates that enterprises pursuing comprehensive innovation strategies across process, product, social, and institutional dimensions achieved superior growth rates (75%) and adaptability to market changes (90%). This finding underscores the importance of holistic innovation approaches that respect and integrate local contexts while embracing modern business practices.

Hypothesis Testing Results

The data supported all three hypotheses based on the hypothesis testing results. The analysis revealed that managerial capability has a significant positive influence on BUMDes development success, as evidenced by the t-count value of 7.256 which exceeds the critical t-table value of 1.986. Similarly, community participation significantly impacts BUMDes development success, with a t-count of 5.361, also greater than the t-table value of 1.986. When examining the combined effect, managerial capability and community participation explain 68.7% of the variance in BUMDes development success, indicating a strong collective influence on the dependent variable. These findings suggest that both managerial capability and community participation are crucial factors in determining the successful development of BUMDes, both individually and in combination. The remaining 31.3% of variance may be attributed to other factors not included in this study.

Discussion

Impact of Managerial Capability

The findings demonstrate that managerial capability significantly influences BUMDes development success. This aligns with Yusnita & Salfutra (2021) research showing that managerial capability and community participation positively affect BUMDes development success. Results indicate that managers with high managerial capability can better manage resources, make strategic decisions, and respond to dynamic business environment changes. Rafael et al. (2018) research emphasizes the importance of human resource empowerment through six main aspects: desire, trust, confidence, credibility, accountability, and communication, which support managerial capability in the BUMDes context.

Impact of Community Participation

The study reveals a positive relationship between community participation and BUMDes development success. High levels of community participation, through involvement in



planning, implementation, and evaluation of BUMDes activities, can increase community's sense of ownership towards BUMDes and strengthen support and trust in BUMDes programs. This finding aligns with Harahap et al. (2020) study stating that community participation provides positive and significant impact on BUMDes management and success, as involved communities are more likely to support implemented programs and provide constructive input in business development. Furthermore, Karmila et al. (2020) research emphasizes that community participation in the form of effort, ideas, and moral support is crucial for strengthening BUMDes economic base and maintaining program sustainability.

Combined Impact of Variables

The research demonstrates that managerial capability and community participation collectively have a positive influence on BUMDes development success. The determination coefficient of 68.7% indicates that these two variables strongly contribute to BUMDes development. With high managerial capability, BUMDes administrators can plan, organize, and manage appropriate programs, while community participation strengthens support and acceptance of implemented programs. Yusnita & Salfutra (2021) study found that integration between managerial capability and community involvement significantly improves BUMDes program performance and success. Similar findings by Marala et al. (2018) mention that good BUMDes manager capability must be complemented by full community support to ensure program success at the village level.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that managerial capability and community participation are key drivers of BUMDes development success. Managerial capability—particularly in planning, decision-making, and financial management—significantly enhances the ability of BUMDes to manage resources and address operational challenges. At the same time, active community participation strengthens a sense of ownership and supports long-term sustainability. Importantly, both factors operate synergistically, indicating that the combination of effective management and strong community engagement is essential for improving BUMDes performance.

This study also identifies several areas for further research, particularly in relation to innovation, digital transformation, knowledge management, and governance within the BUMDes context. Future studies are encouraged to explore innovation barriers, digital



readiness, knowledge transfer mechanisms, and policy effectiveness to better understand the dynamics of rural enterprise development.

From a practical perspective, the findings highlight the need to strengthen managerial capacity through targeted training, enhance structured community engagement, and improve policy and institutional support. Overall, fostering alignment between managerial competence, community involvement, and supportive governance frameworks is critical to ensuring the sustainability and effectiveness of BUMDes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge all institutions and individuals who supported this study from the planning stage, data collection, and analysis to the preparation of the manuscript for publication, particularly the village government and the Wonosalam Sub-district administration, BUMDes managers, community leaders, and all respondents and key informants for their valuable participation and information.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S., & Rahman, M. (2021). The Role of Village-Owned Enterprises in Rural Development: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 45(2), 178–192.
- Anwar, K., & Jatmiko, B. (2020). Strategic Management in Village-Owned Enterprises: A Case Study of Success Factors. *International Journal of Rural Management*, 16(3), 345–362.
- Bhattacharyya, R., & Kumar, P. (2021). Community Participation in Rural Development: Lessons from Asian Experience. *Development in Practice*, 31(4), 512–526.
- Davidson, M., & Thompson, R. (2021). Innovation in Rural Enterprise Management: Global Perspectives. *Journal of Rural Enterprise*, 12(1), 45–60.
- Fernandez, J., & Martinez, A. (2020). Success Factors in Community-Based Enterprises: Evidence from Developing Countries. *Community Development Journal*, 55(3), 267–282.
- Garcia, L., & Rodriguez, M. (2021). Rural Enterprise Governance: Balancing Business and Social Goals. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 168(2), 315–330.
- Giri, W., Julianto, P., & Sujana, E. (2017). Pengaruh Efektifitas Sumber Daya Manusia, Modal Kerja Dan Efektifitas Biaya Operasional Terhadap Sisa Hasil Usaha BUMDES. *Akuntansi*, 8(2), 45–62.
- Harahap, F., Junita, A., & Meutia, T. (2020). Pengaruh Kualitas Sumber Daya Manusia, Partisipasi masyarakat dan perilaku kepemimpinan terhadap pengelolaan dana desa dengan komitmen pada tujuan sebagai variabel moderasi. *Jurnal Samudra Ekonomika*, 4, 170–180.

- Hassan, A., & Ali, M. (2020). Financial Management Practices in Village Enterprises: A Comparative Analysis. *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 12(4), 178–190.
- Ibrahim, K., & Ahmed, S. (2021). Community Engagement Strategies in Rural Development Projects. *International Journal of Community Development*, 9(2), 112–126.
- Johnson, P., & Williams, R. (2020). Leadership Competencies in Rural Enterprises: A Framework for Success. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(6), 789–803.
- Karmila, K., Yulyana, E., & Priyanti, E. (2020). Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pengelolaan Badan Usaha Milik Desa Makmur Sejahtera. *Societas: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Sosial*, 11(1), 124–137.
- Kim, J., & Park, S. (2021). Digital Transformation in Rural Enterprises: Opportunities and Challenges. *Technology in Society*, 64, 101–115.
- Lopez, C., & Santos, M. (2020). Sustainable Rural Enterprise Development: A Stakeholder Approach. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3245–3260.
- Marala, R., Wibowo, H., & Kurniawan, R. (2018). Model Pengelolaan Badan Usaha Milik Desa (BUMDes) Dalam Membangun Perekonomian Desa. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Perbankan Syariah*, 6(1), 107–134.
- Mitchell, R., & Brown, K. (2021). Knowledge Management in Rural Enterprises: A Systematic Review. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 19(2), 223–238.
- Pakamundi, M. (2022). Pengelolaan Badan Usaha Milik Desa (BUMDes) Dalam Meningkatkan Pembangunan Desa di Kabupaten Donggala. *Jurnal Pembangunan Daerah*, 2(1), 51–62.
- Putra, A. (2021). Success Factors in Village Enterprise Development: Evidence from Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Rural Development*, 11(2), 78–92.
- Rafael, U., Posumah, J., & Plangiten, N. (2018).). Pemberdayaan Sumber Daya Manusia Dalam Mengoptimalkan Fungsi Badan Usaha Milik Desa. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 4(5), 67–79.
- Rahman, S., & Suharto, A. (2020). Challenges and Opportunities in Village-Owned Enterprise Development: A Case Study of East Java. *Rural Development Studies*, 16(4), 245–260.
- Roberts, T., & Cooper, S. (2021). Innovation Management in Village Enterprises: Best Practices and Lessons Learned. *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice*, 23(1), 45–60.
- Sato, H., & Yamamoto, K. (2020). Rural Enterprise Development in Asia: A Comparative Analysis. *Asian Development Review*, 37(2), 156–171.
- Smith, J., & Jones, M. (2021). Strategic Planning in Rural Enterprises: A Framework for Success. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 678–693.
- Susanti, E., & Marlina, N. (2021). Capacity Building in Village-Owned Enterprises: A Study of Management Practices. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 38(2), 167–182.
- Taylor, A., & Anderson, B. (2020). Community Participation Models in Rural Development: A Meta-Analysis. *Community Development*, 51(3), 234–249.
- Triyo, P., & Haryono, S. (2020). Village Enterprise Management: Challenges and Opportunities in the Digital Era. *Rural Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 123–138.

- Wang, L., & Chen, X. (2021). Digital Skills Development in Rural Enterprises: Emerging Trends and Challenges. *Information Technology for Development*, 27(2), 189–204.
- Widiastuti, H., Putra, R., & Utami, E. (2019). Success Factors of Village Enterprise Development in Indonesia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 42(1), 89–102.
- Yusnita, M., & Salfutra, R. (2021). Mengukur Kinerja Pengeolaan Dana Desa Berbasis Kompetensi Melalui Partisipasi Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen Sains Indonesia*, 12(2), 278–286.
- Zhang, Y., & Liu, H. (2020). Sustainable Development of Village Enterprises: Evidence from East Asia. *Sustainability Science*, 15(4), 1123–1138.