



Entrepreneurship in Ecuador: Prospects and Challenges in Vulnerable Communities

Luis Abdon Rivera Paredes

Abogado, Instituto Superior Tecnológico Bolivariano de Tecnología, Ecuador

Yaimara Peñate Santana

Ph.D., Universidad de Guayaquil, Ecuador

Maite Nodarse Castillo

Ph.D., Universidad de Cienfuegos “Carlos Rafael Rodríguez”, Cuba

KEYWORDS

Entrepreneurship
Vulnerable communities
Financial inclusion
Digital literacy
Gender equity
Integrative literature review.

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities is a key pathway to socioeconomic inclusion in Ecuador, but it faces structural barriers that limit its sustainability. This article aims to analyze the prospects and challenges of entrepreneurship in vulnerable Ecuadorian communities, identifying the factors that influence its viability. An integrative literature review was conducted using searches in Scopus, Web of Science, SciELO, and Redalyc, as well as institutional sources (INEC, GEM Ecuador, Central Bank of Ecuador), covering the period 2019–2025. After applying inclusion and exclusion criteria, a corpus of 42 documents was analyzed using thematic content analysis and methodological triangulation. The results reveal five interconnected structural barriers: (i) financial exclusion due to restrictive credit requirements, (ii) deficits in business training and digital literacy, (iii) difficulties in accessing expanded markets, (iv) gender gaps and care burdens, and (v) limited local economic impact due to a lack of strategic planning. Based on this analysis, an integrated model for the sustainability of vulnerable entrepreneurship is proposed, which links structural conditions, entrepreneurial capacities, access to resources, institutional-digital coordination, and territorial impact. The study concludes that transforming entrepreneurship into a driver of territorial development requires comprehensive public policies, although the findings are limited by reliance on secondary sources and Ecuador's territorial heterogeneity.

RECEIVED: 21/07/2026

ACCEPTED: 22/09/2026

How to cite this article: (APA 7^a)

Rivera Paredes, L.A., Peñate Santana, Y., Nodarse Castillo, M. (2026). Emprendimientos en el Ecuador: perspectivas y desafíos. *Prisma Social revista de ciencias sociales*, 55, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.65598/rps.6260>

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship is recognized globally as a key driver of economic and social development, as it fosters innovation, job creation, and competitiveness in emerging markets (Kimmitt et al., 2020). According to Acs y Audretsch (2003), Entrepreneurship can serve as a catalyst for economic development, as it fosters innovation and business growth, even in challenging environments. Furthermore, De Soto (2000), It highlights how this activity is essential for transforming capital into wealth, enabling families to improve their quality of life by meeting their basic needs.

The impact of entrepreneurship extends beyond the economic sphere, influencing science, technology, and society as well. Amorós y Bosma (2014) emphasize their importance in driving technological innovation, while Kuratko (2016) It highlights how entrepreneurial ecosystems foster interdisciplinary connections. In the social sphere, entrepreneurship is a vehicle for inclusion, promoting equity and community development among vulnerable populations (Cebrián y Ballesteros, 2021).

Vulnerable communities are defined as those that face significant disadvantages in terms of access to basic resources, education, and employment opportunities, making them particularly susceptible to social and economic exclusion (Fundación Altius, 2023). Según Ordoñez et al. (2020), Entrepreneurship is a key driver of economic growth in these contexts, providing individuals with access to employment and productive opportunities and strengthening community resilience.

In Ecuador, entrepreneurship is particularly important because of its ability to create jobs, foster innovation, and promote local development. However, the lack of job opportunities and economic constraints force many families to turn to entrepreneurship as a means of survival. (Lasio et al., 2022). That is why entrepreneurship plays a fundamental role in strengthening a region's internal or endogenous business ecosystem, as it drives local economic development by generating income and improving the population's quality of life.

In the social sphere, community-based ventures promote economic inclusion, environmental sustainability, and social cohesion, helping to improve the quality of life for vulnerable groups such as older adults, women, and people with disabilities. (Vásquez Erazo et al., 2023). Given their situation, these groups require inclusive development strategies that enable them to access resources, thereby reducing their risk of social exclusion.

In this regard, strengthening the entrepreneurial ecosystem through public policies, inclusive financing, and support networks is essential to ensuring the sustainability of emerging businesses and their positive impact on regional development. Recent studies highlight that community-based entrepreneurship can become a driver of social transformation when combined with training strategies and access to financial resources, thereby overcoming structural market barriers. (Guerrero et al., 2020).

In Ecuador, research on entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities is still in its early stages, focusing primarily on indigenous, women's, and community-based entrepreneurship within the framework of the popular and solidarity economy. These studies highlight the importance of adapting international management models to local cultural practices in order to achieve positive results (Solorzano Bajaña, 2025). They also recognize the role of women's entrepreneurship as a driver of inclusion, although gaps in financing and access to support networks persist (Valencia, Tejena, García, and Véliz, 2023).

For its part, the literature on the popular and solidarity economy emphasizes the need to strengthen administrative and management capacities so that community-based enterprises can achieve sustainability and resilience in the face of poverty (Tobar, Gavilánez, Badillo, and Pinta, 2022).

However, despite progress, research contributions remain scarce and fragmented. Gaps persist in the comprehensive understanding of the management factors that determine the sustainability of

these ventures, particularly as they relate to populations experiencing human mobility and groups in situations of greater socioeconomic precariousness (Díaz-Sánchez and Correa, 2024).

Distinctive Contribution and Operational Definitions. Despite advances in the literature on entrepreneurship in Ecuador, three gaps remain that this article seeks to address. First, most studies address barriers in isolation (financial, educational, or gender-related), without offering a comprehensive analysis that allows for an understanding of their interdependence. Second, there is conceptual confusion between individual entrepreneurship, community entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, and the popular and solidarity economy, which makes it difficult to compare findings. Third, few studies propose an integrative analytical model applicable to the design of regional public policies.

To address these gaps, this article contributes three novel elements: (a) a systematization of the structural barriers to entrepreneurship in vulnerable Ecuadorian communities, organized into five interconnected dimensions; (b) operational definitions that delineate the scope of the study; and (c) a proposal for an integrated sustainability model that links structural conditions, entrepreneurial capacities, access to resources, institutional-digital coordination, and territorial impact.

For analytical purposes, the following operational definitions are adopted. Vulnerable communities are defined as human groups that face cumulative structural disadvantages in accessing economic resources, formal education, basic services, and institutional support networks, which increases their exposure to socioeconomic risks and reduces their resilience to crises (Fundación Altius, 2023; Díaz-Sánchez & Correa, 2024). In the Ecuadorian context, this study considers vulnerable communities to be populations living in poverty and extreme poverty, Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian communities, female heads of household in precarious circumstances, and people experiencing human mobility. Entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities, meanwhile, is defined as any productive initiative formal or informal, individual or collective driven by members of these groups, whose primary purpose is to generate income for subsistence or to improve the living conditions of the household and/or the community, regardless of its focus on growth or scalability. The analytical unit of the study is entrepreneurship considered as a territorial socioeconomic phenomenon, not the individual business or the entrepreneur as an isolated entity.

In this context, the present study aims to analyze the prospects and challenges of entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities in Ecuador, identifying the structural factors that determine its sustainability and proposing an integrative model that brings together the financial, educational, technological, sociocultural, and territorial dimensions. The study is situated within contemporary debates on necessity entrepreneurship, inclusive entrepreneurship, and peripheral entrepreneurial ecosystems, seeking to provide useful evidence for the design of public policies aimed at building a territorially contextualized entrepreneurial ecosystem.

2. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, documentary approach and was conducted through an integrative literature review, following the methodological guidelines proposed by Torraco (2017) and Grant and Booth (2009), which allow for the integration of findings from diverse sources (empirical studies, institutional reports, and theoretical literature) in order to build a broader understanding of a complex phenomenon. This design was selected because of its suitability for addressing multidimensional problems in the social sciences, where evidence is scattered across academic, statistical, and public policy sources.

2.1. Sources and Search Strategy

The search was conducted in four indexed academic databases: Scopus, Web of Science (WoS), SciELO, and Redalyc, supplemented by official institutional sources: the National Institute of Statistics and Censuses (INEC), reports from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM Ecuador), reports from the Central Bank of Ecuador (BCE), and publications from international organizations

(UN Women, World Economic Forum). This combination of sources allows for the triangulation of scientific evidence with contextual and official statistical data.

Search terms were constructed using Boolean operators adapted to each database. In Spanish, the following combinations were used: (“entrepreneurship” OR “entrepreneurs”) AND (“vulnerable communities” OR “poverty” OR “social inclusion” OR “popular and solidarity economy”) AND (“Ecuador” OR “Latin America”). In English: (“entrepreneurship” OR “entrepreneurs”) AND (“vulnerable communities” OR “poverty” OR “social inclusion” OR “necessity entrepreneurship”) AND (“Ecuador” OR “Latin America”).

2.2. Time Period and Eligibility Criteria

The search period spanned the years 2019–2025, in order to capture the most recent scientific literature and statistical data available following the COVID-19 pandemic, an event that reshaped the dynamics of entrepreneurship in the region. Classic works of theoretical reference (De Soto, 2000; Acs & Audretsch, 2003; Hisrich et al., 2017) were also included when they were relevant to the construction of the conceptual framework.

The inclusion criteria were: (i) scientific articles, book chapters, technical reports, and public policy documents; (ii) publications in Spanish or English; (iii) studies focused on Ecuador or, failing that, on Latin America with findings transferable to the Ecuadorian context; (iv) works addressing at least one of the dimensions of analysis: financing, entrepreneurial training, market access, gender, or territorial impact. The exclusion criteria were: (i) articles duplicated in more than one database; (ii) popular science documents lacking empirical or conceptual grounding; (iii) studies focused exclusively on corporate or high-tech entrepreneurship with no connection to contexts of vulnerability; (iv) publications prior to 2019, except for foundational theoretical references.

2.3. Selection Process and Final Corpus

The selection was conducted in three phases. In the first phase, 128 documents were identified following the initial search. In the second phase, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied by reviewing titles and abstracts, reducing the corpus to 67 documents. In the third phase, a critical review of the full texts was conducted, incorporating or discarding sources based on their contribution to the analytical categories, until a final corpus of 42 documents was established (28 peer-reviewed scientific articles, 9 institutional reports, and 5 theoretical reference works).

2.4. Categories of Analysis and Analytical Procedure

The analysis was organized around five categories derived from the conceptual framework and recurring findings in the literature: (i) access to financing and financial inclusion, (ii) entrepreneurship training and digital literacy, (iii) access to markets and associativity, (iv) sociocultural factors and gender equity, and (v) local economic impact and territorial sustainability. These categories served as axes for the thematic coding of the documents.

The analytical procedure combined thematic content analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) with methodological triangulation, cross-referencing findings from the scientific literature with official statistical data and institutional reports. Triangulation allowed for the verification of theoretical assertions against empirical and contextual evidence, thereby strengthening the validity of the results. The findings were subsequently organized into a synthesis matrix that links identified barriers, supporting evidence, and proposals for action.

2.5. Ethical Considerations

As this is a literature review based on publicly available secondary sources, the study did not require ethics committee approval or informed consent. However, the principles of academic integrity, proper citation, and acknowledgment of authorship were rigorously respected.

Note on the empirical scope. Given that the study design is exclusively documentary, the findings presented in the results section do not stem from direct fieldwork with communities. References to community experiences are based on previously published secondary sources.

3. Results

The integrative literature review of the selected corpus (42 documents: 28 scientific articles, 9 institutional reports, and 5 theoretical reference works) allowed us to identify five structural categories that influence entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities in Ecuador. The findings are presented below, organized according to the analytical categories defined in the methodology.

3.1. General Context of Entrepreneurship in Ecuador

Ecuador has one of the highest total entrepreneurial activity (TEA) rates in Latin America, standing at 31% in 2024, which represents a 1% increase over the previous year (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Ecuador, 2024). However, this high rate coexists with an alarming business mortality rate: approximately 90% of startups do not survive beyond three years of operation (Vásquez Erazo et al., 2023). This paradox high creation and low survival characterizes Ecuadorian entrepreneurship as a phenomenon of necessity (necessity entrepreneurship), in which productive initiatives stem more from the lack of formal employment than from an identified market opportunity (Lasio et al., 2024).

3.2. Access to Financing and Financial Inclusion

Financial exclusion emerges as the most recurrent barrier in the analyzed corpus. Traditional banking policies require formal collateral, a credit history, and income levels that most entrepreneurs in vulnerable communities cannot demonstrate (Arregui et al., 2020). The Central Bank of Ecuador (2020) reports that, during periods of economic instability, financial institutions tighten credit requirements and reduce the amounts available, disproportionately affecting lower-income sectors.

The analysis reveals that this restriction creates a cascading effect: the inability to access formal credit pushes entrepreneurs toward informal financing mechanisms such as family loans, community savings networks, or high-interest lenders which perpetuates cycles of precariousness and limits productive reinvestment (Vásquez Erazo et al., 2023). Furthermore, the analysis identified a limited supply of financial instruments tailored to the specific needs of subsistence enterprises, such as microloans with grace periods, alternative collateral, or microinsurance products.

3.3. Entrepreneurship Training and Digital Literacy

Training gaps constitute the second structural category. The analysis shows that a significant proportion of entrepreneurs in vulnerable communities lack basic knowledge of financial planning, the distinction between capital and profits, market analysis, and human resource management (Vizueta Tomalá, 2020; Salgado Monar, 2023). This training gap is exacerbated at the higher education level: access to public university education in Ecuador is regulated by SENESCYT through a quota system that restricts professional training opportunities for those from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds.

The digital acceleration following the COVID-19 pandemic introduced a new dimension to the training gap. The World Economic Forum (2020) and Vásquez Erazo et al. (2023) agree that digital literacy understood as the ability to use technological tools for business management, marketing, and basic analytics has become a prerequisite for competitiveness, but access to it remains unequal in rural, indigenous, and Afro-Ecuadorian communities.

3.4. Market Access and Associativity

Geographic isolation and bureaucratic barriers constitute a third category of challenges. The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Ecuador (2023/2024) reports that 67.85% of entrepreneurs perceive significant difficulties in starting and sustaining businesses due to bureaucracy and tax burdens. In the case of indigenous and rural communities, access to broader markets is limited by a lack of logistics infrastructure, competition from lower-cost industrialized products, and dependence on informal marketing networks (World Economic Forum, 2020).

However, the analysis also identified positive experiences related to collective action. The formation of cooperatives, joint distribution networks, and shared brands has enabled certain groups particularly in the artisanal, agricultural, and tourism sectors to improve their bargaining power, stabilize demand, and meet public and private procurement requirements (Tobar et al., 2022; Ordoñez et al., 2020).

3.5. Sociocultural Factors and Gender Equity

The issue of gender cuts across all other dimensions. UN Women (2021) and Valencia et al. (2023) document that women entrepreneurs in Ecuador face specific barriers: greater restrictions on access to financing, an excessive burden of unpaid care work, cultural stereotypes that limit their participation in decision-making spaces, and reduced access to business support networks. Fernández and Ruiz (2023) note that these inequalities are exacerbated in rural and Indigenous communities, where traditional cultural norms reinforce the gender division of labor.

The literature review shows, however, that the incorporation of digital platforms and specific empowerment programs has enabled certain groups of women and Indigenous people to partially overcome these historical barriers, fostering entrepreneurial ventures rooted in cultural identity and community engagement (Solorzano Bajiña, 2025; Melgarejo, 2024).

3.6. Local Economic Impact and Territorial Sustainability

The fifth category refers to the actual scope of entrepreneurial ventures in territorial development. The findings indicate that, while entrepreneurial ventures in vulnerable communities fulfill an essential subsistence function ensuring access to food, health care, and basic education their aggregate economic impact remains limited (Zambrano Mieles et al., 2023). A lack of strategic planning, limited capacity for scaling up, and insufficient coordination with regional production chains explain why most of these initiatives fail to move beyond the realm of self-employment.

Cebrián and Ballesteros (2021) and Kimmitt et al. (2020) qualify this finding by noting that the impact should not be measured exclusively in financial terms: community-based enterprises generate positive externalities in social cohesion, environmental sustainability, and the preservation of cultural identities dimensions that the literature on territorial development recognizes as components of collective well-being.

3.7. Summary of Findings

Table 1 summarizes the findings by category, identifying structural barriers, the supporting documentary evidence, and the specific manifestations observed in the Ecuadorian context.

Table 1. *Summary of structural barriers to entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities in Ecuador.*

Categoría analítica	Barreras identificadas	Evidencia documental
---------------------	------------------------	----------------------

Acceso a financiamiento	Requisitos crediticios restrictivos, ausencia de historial crediticio, tasas elevadas, escasez de instrumentos adaptados	Arregui et al. (2020); Banco Central del Ecuador (2020); Vásquez Erazo et al. (2023)
Formación empresarial y alfabetización digital	Déficit en gestión financiera, planificación y marketing; brecha digital post-pandemia	Vizueta Tomalá (2020); Salgado Monar (2023); World Economic Forum (2020)
Acceso a mercados	Burocracia, cargas impositivas, aislamiento geográfico, dependencia de redes informales	GEM Ecuador (2023/2024); World Economic Forum (2020)
Factores socioculturales y género	Sobrecarga de cuidados, estereotipos, menor acceso a redes y financiamiento	ONU Mujeres (2021); Valencia et al. (2023); Fernández y Ruiz (2023)
Impacto económico local	Baja planificación, escaso escalamiento, impacto limitado más allá de la subsistencia	Zambrano Mieles et al. (2023); Cebrián y Ballesteros (2021)

Nota. Elaboración propia a partir del análisis documental integrativo.

4. Discussion

The findings of this study confirm that entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities in Ecuador is constrained by a web of interconnected structural barriers, which can only be overcome through comprehensive interventions rather than isolated actions. This result aligns with the arguments put forth by Tobar et al. (2022) regarding the popular and solidarity economy as an alternative model for inclusion; however, it goes further by demonstrating that the five categories identified—financing, training, markets, gender, and territorial impact—operate systemically rather than independently.

4.1. Contrasts with the International Literature on Necessity Entrepreneurship

Ecuador's high TEA (31%), combined with a three-year business mortality rate of 90%, places the Ecuadorian case within the realm of necessity entrepreneurship described by Acs et al. (2008) and Naudé (2013). However, there is a significant divergence from the findings of these authors: while the international literature suggests that necessity entrepreneurship tends to be concentrated in sectors with low productivity and little value added, in Ecuador there are examples of community-based and Indigenous enterprises that combine subsistence with cultural preservation and sustainable tourism (Solorzano Bajaña, 2025; Tobar et al., 2022). This distinctive feature indicates that the model of necessity entrepreneurship must be nuanced in Latin American contexts where the community economy and cultural identity play a structuring role.

4.2. The Paradox of Financial Inclusion

The analysis confirms that financial exclusion is the most persistent barrier, in line with Arregui et al. (2020) and the Central Bank of Ecuador (2020). However, the results also reveal a paradox that has been little explored in the local literature: even though public microcredit programs such as those offered by the Development Bank of Ecuador exist, their actual reach in vulnerable

communities is limited due to a lack of technical support and the inadequacy of financial products for the seasonal cash flows of the rural economy. This finding aligns with Bateman's (2012) arguments regarding the limits of microfinance as a stand-alone development strategy and suggests that credit alone is a necessary but not sufficient condition for entrepreneurial sustainability.

4.3. The Digital Divide and Business Resilience

The post-pandemic digital acceleration introduced a new variable that the Ecuadorian literature is only beginning to incorporate. The results show that digital literacy acts as a differentiating factor: ventures that managed to incorporate it during the pandemic exhibited higher levels of resilience, consistent with the findings of Kraus et al. (2020) on digital entrepreneurship in crisis contexts. However, there is a significant gap between this evidence and the reality of rural and indigenous communities, where connectivity remains precarious. This regional divergence poses a specific challenge for public policy: digitalization cannot be a one-size-fits-all strategy but must be adapted to the infrastructure conditions of each region.

4.4. Gender: Between Confirmation and Transformative Experiences

The results confirm the gender gaps documented by UN Women (2021) and Valencia et al. (2023). However, the analysis also identifies experiences in which the integration of digital platforms, community support networks, and empowerment programs has enabled women and Indigenous peoples to transform barriers into opportunities for entrepreneurship rooted in cultural identity (Solorzano Bajaña, 2025; Melgarejo, 2024). This finding qualifies the predominantly victimizing perspective found in the literature and suggests that public policies must recognize not only the vulnerabilities but also the capacities and prior knowledge of these groups.

4.5. Toward an Integrated Model of Sustainability

The integration of the five analytical axes allows us to propose an integrated model of sustainability for vulnerable entrepreneurship that connects: (i) structural conditions of the territory, (ii) individual and collective entrepreneurial capacities, (iii) access to financial and training resources, (iv) institutional and digital coordination, and (v) territorial impact. This model goes beyond the sectoral approaches prevalent in the Ecuadorian literature and aligns with the approaches to peripheral entrepreneurial ecosystems proposed by Stam (2015) and Spigel (2017), adapted to the context of Latin American popular economies.

4.6. Proposed Actions Derived from the Analysis

Based on the findings, five lines of action consistent with the proposed model are derived.

Table 2. *Proposed Actions for Strengthening Entrepreneurship in Vulnerable Communities.*

Barrera	Acción propuesta	Impacto esperado
Acceso a financiamiento	Líneas de crédito asequibles, microcréditos con garantías flexibles y acompañamiento financiero	Mayor acceso a recursos formales, reducción de dependencia de esquemas informales y aumento de la supervivencia empresarial
Formación empresarial	Formación modular en gestión, integrada con alfabetización digital	Mejora en la gestión, innovación en productos y transición del autoempleo a unidades productivas con valor agregado

Acceso a mercados	Infraestructura logística, plataformas digitales de comercio y fomento de cooperativas	Expansión de mercados, reducción de costos de distribución y mayor estabilidad económica
Factores socioculturales	Políticas de reducción de brechas de género, horarios compatibles con cuidados y redes de apoyo	Inclusión de grupos marginados y fortalecimiento del tejido social
Impacto económico local	Incentivos fiscales a modelos sostenibles y promoción del emprendimiento social territorial	Mayor generación de empleo y reducción de pobreza y desigualdad

Nota. Elaboración propia a partir del análisis documental integrativo.

5. Conclusions

This study analyzed the prospects and challenges of entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities in Ecuador, identifying five structural categories that influence its sustainability: access to financing, entrepreneurship training and digital literacy, access to markets, sociocultural and gender factors, and regional economic impact. Based on these findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

Entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities in Ecuador operates predominantly as a subsistence strategy (necessity entrepreneurship), characterized by a high rate of start-ups and a high rate of early failure. This paradox suggests that public policies should be aimed not only at promoting the creation of new ventures but also at strengthening the conditions for the survival and scaling up of existing ones.

The identified barriers do not operate in isolation but are interrelated within a system that perpetuates vulnerability. Financial exclusion feeds into educational deficits; the lack of training limits access to markets; and gender inequalities cut across all other dimensions. This interdependence justifies the need for comprehensive approaches, in contrast to prevailing sectoral policies.

The results suggest that transforming entrepreneurship into a driver of territorial development could be achieved by coordinating five areas of action: inclusive financing with technical support, modular training integrated with digital literacy, logistics infrastructure and marketing platforms, gender equity policies, and incentives for sustainable models. However, these proposals should be understood as guidelines derived from a literature review, whose concrete effectiveness requires empirical validation in specific contexts.

The study provides an integrated model of sustainability for vulnerable entrepreneurship that links structural conditions, entrepreneurial capacities, access to resources, institutional-digital coordination, and territorial impact. This model constitutes a conceptual tool that could be reused in future research and in the design of territorial public policies, although its applicability requires adaptations to the cultural and geographic particularities of each context.

The evidence analyzed suggests that entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities, if accompanied by comprehensive and context-specific public policies, could contribute to improving quality of life and reducing socioeconomic inequalities. However, this assertion must be qualified: entrepreneurship alone is not sufficient to transform historically entrenched structures of poverty, and its actual impact depends on broader macroeconomic, institutional, and regional conditions

This study has several limitations that must be acknowledged in order to properly contextualize the scope of its findings.

This is an integrative literature review based on secondary sources, which implies a dependence on the quality, coverage, and biases of the analyzed publications. The findings do not stem from direct fieldwork with communities; therefore, they do not capture the diversity of territorial experiences in all their complexity.

The heterogeneity of the sources—which combine peer-reviewed scientific articles, institutional reports, and theoretical literature—introduces methodological challenges in comparing and synthesizing evidence, particularly regarding the conceptual frameworks and time scales used.

The search period (2019–2025) includes the COVID-19 pandemic as a disruptive event, which may have introduced temporal biases in the statistical data and in the reported entrepreneurial dynamics.

Ecuador exhibits marked territorial heterogeneity across the coast, the highlands, the Amazon, and the island region, with significant socioeconomic, cultural, and productive differences. The findings of this study do not allow for uniform generalizations across these contexts; therefore, its conclusions should be interpreted as general trends subject to local variations.

Selection bias in the literature is inherent in any integrative review: indexed databases tend to prioritize publications in Spanish and English by authors with greater academic capital, which may have marginalized community knowledge and local experiences not formalized in scientific publications.

References

- Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2003). *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research: An Interdisciplinary Survey and Introduction*. Springer.
- Acs, Z. J., Desai, S., & Hessels, J. (2008). Entrepreneurship, economic development and institutions. *Small Business Economics*, 31(3), 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-008-9135-9>
- Amorós, J. E., & Bosma, N. (2014). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2013 Global Report*. Global Entrepreneurship Research Association.
- Arregui, R., Guerrero, R. M., & Ponce, K. (2020). Inclusión financiera y desarrollo: Situación actual, retos y desafíos de la banca. *Universidad Espíritu Santo - Ecuador*.
- Banco Central del Ecuador. (2020). *Reporte trimestral de oferta y demanda de crédito*. Subgerencia de Programación y Regulación. <https://www.bce.fin.ec>
- Bateman, M. (2012). The role of microfinance in poverty reduction: A critical perspective. *Journal of Development Studies*, 48(10), 1447-1462. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2012.696354>
- Benítez Pincay, L., Ortiz Ramírez, C., & Lema Cachinell, B. (2024). Emprendimiento: Un escenario con potencial para el desarrollo. *Prohominum. Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.47606/acven/ph0243>

- Cebrián, M., & Ballesteros, B. (2021). Emprendimiento social como motor de desarrollo en comunidades vulnerables. *Prisma Social: Revista de Investigación Social*, (32), 234–255. <https://revistaprismasocial.es/article/view/4123>
- De Soto, H. (2000). *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*. Basic Books.
- Díaz-Sánchez, J. P., & Correa, H. (2024). Immigration and formal labor market participation in Ecuador: Empirical insights from a developing nation. *Research in Globalization*, 8, 100198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resglo.2024.100198>
- Fernández, A., & Ruiz, M. (2023). Inclusión financiera y empoderamiento de la mujer emprendedora en América Latina. *Prisma Social: Revista de Investigación Social*, (40), 150–172. <https://revistaprismasocial.es/article/view/4589>
- Fundación Altius. (2023). *La vulnerabilidad: concepto, grupos, causas y consecuencias*. <https://www.fundacionaltius.org>
- Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Ecuador. (2024). *Informe GEM Ecuador 2023-2024*. Universidad Espíritu Santo (UEES), Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja (UTPL) y Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador (PUCE). <https://www.gemconsortium.org>
- Guerrero, M., Urbano, D., & Gajón, E. (2020). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and the role of universities in emerging economies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 150, 119756. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119756>
- Hisrich, R. D., Peters, M. P., & Shepherd, D. A. (2017). *Entrepreneurship* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Kimmitt, J., Muñoz, P., & Farny, S. (2020). Entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation. *World Development*, 125, 104668. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104668>
- Kraus, S., Palmer, C., Kailer, N., Kallinger, F. L., & Spitzer, J. (2020). Digital entrepreneurship: A research agenda on new business models for the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 26(2), 353-375. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-06-2018-0425>
- Kuratko, D. F. (2016). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, Process, and Practice* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Lasio, V., Ordeñana, X., & Zambrano, J. (2024). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Ecuador 2023-2024: *Tendencias post-pandemia y emprendimiento por necesidad*. ESPOL. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381802686>
- Martínez, P. (2021). *Diseño de un modelo para la enseñanza del emprendimiento en contextos vulnerables*. Universidad Nacional Abierta y a Distancia (UNAD). <https://repository.unad.edu.co/jspui/bitstream/10596/80894/1/memartinezpa.pdf>
- Melgarejo, B. D. (2024). La gestión para fomentar el emprendimiento comunitario en la educación superior. *Revista ESS*, 36(2), 15-30. <https://ess.iesalc.unesco.org/index.php/ess3/article/view/v36i2-sg-15/741>

- Naudé, W. (2013). Entrepreneurship and economic development: Theory, evidence and policy. *IZA Discussion Paper*, No. 7507. Institute of Labor Economics (IZA). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2306152>
- Núñez Jover, J. (2020). Políticas de educación superior, ciencia, tecnología e innovación y desarrollo territorial: nuevas experiencias, nuevos enfoques. *Revista Iberoamericana de Ciencia, Tecnología y Sociedad - CTS*, 15(43), 187-208. <https://www.oei.es/historico/revistactsi/>
- ONU Mujeres. (2021). *Eliminar las barreras de género en el acceso al financiamiento y redes de apoyo para mujeres emprendedoras*. ONU Mujeres – América Latina y el Caribe. <https://lac.unwomen.org/es>
- Ordoñez, J., et al. (2020). El emprendimiento como impulsor del desarrollo económico en comunidades vulnerables. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades*, 4(2), 4609. <https://doi.org/10.56712/latam.v4i2.923>
- Portales, L., & Arandia Pérez, O. (2015). Emprendimiento y Empresa Social Como Estrategia de Desarrollo Local. *Recherches en Sciences de Gestion*, 6(111), 137-160. <https://doi.org/10.3917/resg.111.0137>
- Salgado Monar, J. H. (2023). El Emprendimiento en el Ecuador. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades*, 4(2), 4609. <https://doi.org/10.56712/latam.v4i2.923>
- Spigel, B. (2017). The relational organization of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 49-72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12167>
- Solorzano Bajaña, B. (2025). Iron Cage for Indigenous Entrepreneurs? Understanding the Movement and Impact of External Ideas on Indigenous Entrepreneurship in Ecuador. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 197(2), 345-362. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05781-1>
- Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique. *European Planning Studies*, 23(9), 1759-1769. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2015.1061484>
- Tobar, A. M. S., Gavilánez, E. B. O., Badillo, P. L. R., & Pinta, D. A. M. (2022). De una Economía Popular y Solidaria rumbo a una Economía Social y Comunitaria: Ecuador como caso de estudio. *Revista Economía y Política*, (36), 79-96. <https://doi.org/10.25097/rep.n36.2022.06>
- Valencia, M. N. V., Tejena, P. N. P., García, J. I. M., & Véliz, D. K. M. (2023). Emprendimiento, una oportunidad de vida para la mujer ecuatoriana. *Revista San Gregorio*, 1(56), 132-145. <https://doi.org/10.36097/rsan.v1i56.2514>
- Vásquez Erazo, J., Mendoza, R., & López, A. (2023). El emprendimiento comunitario y su impacto en la transformación social: Acceso a formación y recursos financieros. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, 8(6), 14671. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v8i6.14671
- Villafuerte Salazar, S., Cornejo Rojas, A., & Giraldo Pizarro, D. V. (2024). Redes de emprendimiento y gestión empresarial con enfoque de género en micro y pequeñas empresas. *Revista Científica INTEGRACIÓN*, 8(2), 45-62. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=9123456>

World Economic Forum. (2020). *The Future of Jobs Report 2020*. World Economic Forum.
<https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2020>