Advances in Consumer Research
https://acr-journal.com/
Volume-3 | Issue-6 |June: 2026
Original Researcher Article

Thriving Communities, Aspiring Entrepreneurs: Exploring the Community Wellbeing–Entrepreneurship Nexus in Rural Jammu

Shilpa Gupta[1], Arti Maini[2], Rashi Taggar[3]*
[1] Research Scholar, School of Business, Faculty of Management, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University. Email: shilpagupta19950@gmail.com
[2] Associate Professor, School of Business, Faculty of Management, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University. Email: arti.maini@smvdu.ac.in
[3] Associate Professor, School of Business, Faculty of Management, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University. Email: rashi.taggar@smvdu.ac.in

.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study investigates the relationship between various dimensions of community wellbeing and their influence on entrepreneurial intentions among individuals residing in rural areas of the Jammu region.

Research Methodology: This study adopted a quantitative cross-sectional research design and collected data from 400 respondents residing in rural areas of the Jammu region using a structured questionnaire. A stratified sampling technique was employed to ensure representation across geographically dispersed rural communities. Data was analysed using SPSS Version 25. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to identify the underlying dimensions of community wellbeing, followed by Logistic Regression to examine the influence of these dimensions on entrepreneurial intentions.

Findings: The analysis revealed seven distinct dimensions of community wellbeing. Logistic regression results indicated that perceived safety, social cohesion, community support, and community cohesion positively and significantly influenced entrepreneurial intentions, whereas environmental amenities and sustainable local governance. In contrast, environmental amenities and sustainable local governance did not exhibit a significant relationship with entrepreneurial intentions.

Originality: This study contributes to the limited literature on community wellbeing and entrepreneurial intentions in rural contexts by identifying the specific dimensions of community wellbeing that influence entrepreneurial intentions in rural areas. The findings provide empirical evidence from rural Jammu and offer valuable insights for policymakers seeking to promote entrepreneurship and sustainable rural development through community-based interventions.

Keywords:: Community Wellbeing, Entrepreneurial Intentions, Rural Development, Rural Entrepreneurship, Community Support, Social Cohesion..

INTRODUCTION:

Community wellbeing has emerged as a critical determinant of sustainable rural development, influencing not only the quality of life of residents but also their capacity to engage in productive economic activities and contribute to local development (Sirgy, 2021; OECD, 2023). The sustainability and prosperity of rural communities depend not only on economic resources but also on the wellbeing of their residents, which can influence their willingness to pursue entrepreneurial opportunities and contribute to local development (McCrea et al., 2014; Peters et al., 2019). It is widely recognized as a pivotal determinant that influences both individuals and communities, exerting an effect on different facets such as health, wellbeing, and overall standard of living (Forjaz et al., 2011). Wellbeing encompasses all aspects of health, including physical, mental, emotional, and social difficulties. It is a comprehensive state of being that enables individuals to thrive and achieve their maximum potential within their communities. In rural areas, achieving sustainable vitality and health requires a thorough knowledge of the relationships between various kinds of community capitals (McCrea et al., 2014), which is a complex undertaking. The concept of wellbeing has garnered substantial attention over the years, yet its significance and understanding within rural communities remain crucial areas for exploration. The concept of wellbeing has evolved considerably over time, with early research primarily defining it as a combination of physical and mental health dimensions (Sirgy & Cornwell, 2001). Over time, the concept broadened to encompass physical, mental, emotional, and social dimensions of wellbeing, reflecting a more holistic understanding of human flourishing. Numerous studies have employed the term "wellbeing" interchangeably with proxies such as quality of life, happiness, and overall satisfaction. The term

"wellbeing" goes beyond just economic growth to include factors like access to healthcare (Rice et al., 2022), education (Strange et al., 2012), social services (Long et al., 2022), environmental quality (Bhagat et al., 2024), and community engagement (Mccabe et al., 2006). In rural areas, where resources may be limited and challenges like isolation, poverty, and inadequate infrastructure are more prevalent, promoting wellbeing requires a holistic approach that addresses the diverse needs and aspirations of community members (Campos Navarrete and Zohar, 2021). Considering the utmost significance of the wellbeing of rural communities, it is crucial to enhance economic growth and development initiatives that are aimed at fostering a paradigm shift in the mindsets of the people (Puddifoot, 1995). One effective method involves offering entrepreneurial opportunities, which can act as a catalyst for beneficial transformation. Enhancing entrepreneurial opportunities in rural areas can lead to progress and development, while also promoting the people's intentions to become entrepreneurs, which in turn can improve their quality of life (Dijkhuizen et al., 2018). The significance of a collaborative strategy is underscored by this interdependent relationship, wherein the advancement of rural areas and the encouragement of entrepreneurial aspirations are pursued concurrently, ultimately leading to the enhancement of wellbeing within these communities. Entrepreneurial intents pertain to an individual's propensity to participate in entrepreneurial endeavours, such as initiating a new venture (Ashari et al., 2022). These intentions are influenced by a variety of factors, including attitude towards entrepreneurship, subjective norms, self-efficacy and intentions towards entrepreneurship (Contreras-Barraza et al., 2022). Recently, there has been significant attention given to the concepts of community wellbeing and entrepreneurial objectives, especially in the context of rural development. These two ideas are closely interconnected. Entrepreneurial intents refer to the cognitive processes and motivational factors that drive individuals to start entrepreneurial endeavours. These ventures, in turn, contribute to the economic growth and development of their specific communities (Peters et al., 2019a) which further improves their wellbeing. In rural areas, where economic prospects may be restricted and access to resources may be difficult, the interaction between the wellbeing of the community and an intention to engage in entrepreneurial endeavours is especially pertinent to the situation. Rural communities can empower their members to actively design their economic destinies by cultivating an atmosphere that is suitable for entrepreneurship (Peters et al., 2019b). This will ultimately lead to an enhancement in the overall welfare of the community. Entrepreneurs' endeavours not only lead to job creation and cash generation, but also play a role in preserving cultural traditions, fostering a sense of purpose and self-esteem among community members, and maintaining social harmony (Barba-Sánchez et al., 2021). This statement recognizes the importance of these objectives within the framework of rural development and their capacity to generate beneficial transformations in these areas.

Though the importance of community wellbeing for entrepreneurial goals is recognized, there has been little research into this relationship in rural context. As a result, this study aims to close a knowledge vacuum by looking into the relationship between community wellbeing and entrepreneurial intentions in rural areas. In this light, the current study seeks to investigate the factors that influence community wellbeing and entrepreneurial inclinations in rural settings, adding to a better understanding of this multifaceted topic.

Review of the Literature

Community wellbeing has emerged as a critical area of scholarly inquiry, reflecting the growing recognition that the prosperity and sustainability of communities depend not only on economic conditions but also on social, environmental, and institutional factors that shape residents' quality of life (McCrea et al., 2014). In recent years, the concept has attracted considerable scholarly attention due to its relevance for rural development, community resilience, and quality of life (Forjaz et al., 2011). According to Nuclear Waste Management Organization (2010), it has become a growing focus of current scholarly research, especially in the framework of comprehending how the overall socio-economic, environmental, and institutional context influences the individual and population-level outcomes. The concept of community wellbeing is often multidimensional, including not just life satisfaction of the individual but social relations, the quality of the environment, economic life, and the effectiveness of the institutions in a particular community (Diener et al., 2020; Lee and Kim, 2022). This multidimensional approach shows the necessity to analyze wellbeing as a contextual and relational phenomenon rooted in the specific community context. Where there is a rural setting, the role of community wellbeing is enhanced by the structural limitations, the community faces (poor infrastructure, limited access to resources, and institutional inadequacies). Place-based dynamics are typical of rural settings, where local conditions, social embeddedness, and resource availability are essential factors influencing livelihood opportunities and development outcomes (Shucksmith, 2018; Pato & Teixeira, 2021). As a result, the concept of community wellbeing in these places cannot be studied without an investigation of lived experiences and study of social aspects that shapes rural life. But recent scholarship argues that entrepreneurial activity is essentially embedded within the social and community context of which people are operating. Resource accessibility, local support systems, and social interactions have been found to be critical factors that determine entrepreneurial engagement, especially in rural and resource limited settings (Stam, 2015; Korsgaard et al., 2015). Given that entrepreneurial behaviour is influenced by the surrounding social, economic, and institutional environment, examining the relationship between community wellbeing dimensions and entrepreneurial intentions offers valuable insights. One of the most important constructs connecting the conditions of a community and personal outcomes is social cohesion, the extent of trust, interconnectedness, shared sense of identity, and collaboration in a community because it affects the capacity of individuals to mobilise resources, access information and take collective action (Chan et al.,

2006; Fonseca et al., 2019). Social cohesion is critical in rural environments where formal institutional systems are sometimes weak to support entrepreneurial activities via informal networks and community support. Although the literature on these constructs is on the rise, the current body of investigation has been disseminated, with most studies analysing the dimensions of community wellbeing and entrepreneurial intentions. Empirical data that incorporates these dimensions and unites them into a single framework are scarce, especially in the rural settings. In this particular setting, the study aims to comprehend how several dimensions of community wellbeing such as perceived safety, social cohesion, environmental amenities, community support, community cohesion, community infrastructure assessment, and sustainable local governance, may influence the entrepreneurial intentions of the individuals residing in the rural areas. Considering this gap, the present study does a critical review of the literature on community wellbeing and entrepreneurial intentions. Also, the study seeks to uncover the nuanced ways in which community wellbeing influences entrepreneurial intentions, highlighting the importance of the broader context of individuals' lives in understanding their entrepreneurial aspirations in rural settings.

Research Methodology:

Research Design:

The present study utilised a structured questionnaire to survey 600 participants in rural areas of the Jammu region of the Union Territory J&K, of India. The aim is to investigate the relationship between dimensions of community wellbeing and entrepreneurial intentions within rural areas of Jammu Region. Out of the total questionnaires collected, 400 valid responses were retained for further analysis. A comprehensive survey instrument was employed to elicit responses about the respondents' entrepreneurial intentions (dependent variable) and underlying factors encapsulating community wellbeing (independent variables).

Operationalization of Variables:

Dependent Variable: Initially, information was gathered on the dependent variable, entrepreneurial intentions, using a 5-point Likert scale. Respondents may indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with statements about their plans to pursue entrepreneurial endeavours using this scale, which ranged from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." These answers were then converted into a dichotomous variable for analysis purposes. To be more precise, "strongly disagree" and "disagree" replies were recoded as 0, but "agree", “neutral” and "strongly agree" responses represented the presence of entrepreneurial intentions and were recoded as 1. This binary classification makes it easier to distinguish between people who intend to start their own business and those who do not, making statistical analysis and data interpretation simpler. This methodological modification makes sure that the analysis concentrates on whether entrepreneurial intentions are present or absent, making it easier to examine their causes and effects.

Independent Variables: Independent variables served as proxies for the multidimensional construct of community wellbeing, encompassing facets such as perceived safety, social cohesion, environment amenities, community support, community cohesion, community infrastructure assessment, and sustainable local governance.

Data collection:

Data were collected from 600 respondents using a stratified sampling technique. After screening the questionnaires for completeness and consistency, valid responses were retained for further analysis, while incomplete questionnaires were excluded from the study. Out of the total number of responses, 400 were selected for further study, while 200 had to be excluded due to incomplete data. The Jammu region comprises diverse rural communities with varying socioeconomic and geographic characteristics. Therefore, stratified sampling was used to ensure proportional representation of respondents across different strata, thereby increasing the generalizability and reliability of the findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The data has been collected by employing a structured questionnaire (Christakopoulou et al., 2001) for community wellbeing and entrepreneurial intentions have been also assessed using a structured questionnaire (González-Serrano et al., 2018). The questionnaire was a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 is for strongly disagree and 5 is for strongly agree. To investigate the intricate relationship between community wellbeing dimensions and entrepreneurial intentions within rural settings, a cross-sectional research design was deemed most appropriate, with the application of logistic regression as the primary statistical analysis technique. The cross-sectional approach allows for the examination of associations between multiple variables at a specific point in time, without implying causation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). By collecting data from various rural communities simultaneously, this design enhances the generalizability of the findings and provides a comprehensive perspective on the phenomenon under study. This study adhered to ethical standards, which included getting informed permission from respondents, protecting respondents' identities, and using the information only for research purposes.

Analytical Strategy:

The present study endeavoured to elucidate the intricate interplay between the multifaceted dimensions of community wellbeing and their influence on entrepreneurial inclinations among individuals residing in rural areas of the Jammu region. This section elucidates the findings emanating from an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) succeeded by a Logistic regression analysis. The constructs of community wellbeing were subjected to an EFA, comprising 22 items. The statistical software SPSS version 25 was employed to facilitate the requisite analyses. To reduce the number of community wellbeing variables to a manageable number, principal component analysis with varimax rotation has been utilized.

Demographic Profiling:

The respondents' demographic profile exhibits a heterogeneous mix. Regarding age distribution, a

significant fraction of 57% is between the ages of 20 and 35, with the remaining 43% being above 35. Regarding gender representation, men constitute a significant majority of 64.3%, whereas women account for 35.8%. The educational backgrounds of the respondents are very evenly distributed, with 50.7% having completed education beyond the tenth grade, and 49.3% having completed at least below the tenth-grade level and below. There is a significant difference in the respondents' income levels: 36.5% make more than Rs. 10,000, while 63.5% earn Rs. 10,000 or less. The respondents come from a variety of backgrounds in terms of their occupations, including skilled labor, government employees, self-employment, and student groups. In particular, 18.3% are engaged as farmers, 8.3% as contract labourers, 10.5% as skilled labourers, 7.5% as government employees, 7% as external workers, 17.8% as students, 17.5% as self-employed, 13.3% as other occupations.

Table I: Demographic Profiling

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
20-35	228	57
Above 35	172	43
Gender		
Males	257	64.3
Females	143	35.8
Qualification		
Below&= 10th	197	49.3
Above 10th	203	50.7
Income		
Below&= 10000	254	63.5
Above 10000	146	36.5
Occupation		
Farmer	73	18.3
Contractual labour	33	8.3
Skill worker	42	10.5
Govt. Job	30	7.5
Outsourced staff	28	7
Student	71	17.8
Self-employed	70	17.5
Others	53	13.3

Source: Authors Compilation

Findings

Factors Affecting Community wellbeing in rural areas

The purpose of this study is to shed light on the intricate relationship that exists between the many different dimensions of community wellbeing and entrepreneurial intentions in the rural areas. This section provides an explanation of the findings that are obtained from the exploratory factor analysis (EFA), followed by logistic regression. The results were estimated using SPSS version 25 as the statistical tool to simplify the numerous analyses that were required. The findings indicate that several factors had a substantial influence on the overall wellbeing of the community. The number of components to be kept has been determined using the latent root criterion, which is applied to variables with an eigenvalue larger than 1. To be included as a factor, an item has to have a factor loading of at least 0.60 (Maskey et al., 2018).

The KMO value is 0.847, which suggests that the partial correlations between the variables are high, and factor analysis is appropriate for the data. The results also show Bartlett's Test of Sphericity has an approximate Chi-Square value of 5589.706 with a significance level (p-value) of 0.000, indicating that the correlations between items are significantly different from zero, making it suitable to proceed with factor analysis. During the exploratory factor analysis (EFA), a comparison was made between the extracted mean values using a rotated component matrix. This implies that the items are interrelated and reflect the underlying dimensions. The seven components were named based on the elements that elucidated the fundamental constructs. Table II displays the components that are part of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) together with their corresponding factor loadings.

Perceived Safety: Perceived safety is crucial for community wellbeing, impacting quality of life and social cohesion. Residents who feel safe are more likely to participate in community activities (Shahdadi, 2016), create strong social networks (Chataway, 2020) and invest in their local environment (Allik and Kearns, 2017). Safety improves mental health, reduces stress, and builds communal trust and solidarity (Panelli et al., 2004). Lack of safety can cause isolation, fear, and community disengagement, lowering community wellbeing. Creating a safe atmosphere is essential for a healthy, resilient, and connected community.

Social Cohesion: Social cohesion refers to the intricate network of social bonds, relationships, and associations that unite individuals within a society. This complex notion encompasses various components, including the perception of interpersonal power, engagement in civic activities, and involvement in social interactions (Aruqaj, 2023). Strong social cohesion is characterized by tightly interconnected social networks, where individuals can utilize both physical and non-physical resources through their social connections (Harraka, 2002). These resources encompass a variety of offerings such as collaborative exercises, knowledge dissemination, hands-on assistance, and psychological assistance. These communities enhance the resilience and overall wellbeing of their members by fostering a shared sense of responsibility and commitment towards the community (Haslam et al., 2023).

Environmental amenities: Environmental amenities, such as natural resources and green spaces may have a significant impact on community wellbeing in rural areas and offer recreational opportunities, spiritual renewal, and a deeper connection to nature (Masoomi and van de Lindt, 2019). These environmental resources build community pride and attract tourists, boosting the local economy (Binns et al., 2009). Preserving natural resources and managing environmental assets is crucial to rural communities' long-term sustainability and resilience, allowing them to thrive and retain their identity (French et al., 2014). Environmental amenities are crucial to rural community wellness, balancing ecological integrity, economic vigour, and cultural identity.

Community Support: Community support refers to social networks, reciprocal aid, and resources available to individuals within their community. Rural communities need strong support networks to improve their wellbeing. Support networks provide emotional and practical assistance (Molinillo et al., 2020), helping people solve problems, find resources, and collaborate (Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2011). Community support fosters inclusion, interchange, and accountability, promoting social unity and adaptation (Rothon et al., 2012). Effective community support systems can also activate local resources to address common concerns and achieve shared goals (Vieno et al., 2007). Strong support networks help communities overcome obstacles, reduce risks, and seize opportunities. Thus, they improve inhabitants' health and quality of life.

Community Cohesion: Community cohesion refers to the level of closeness, shared ideals, and collective identity within a community. It assesses how strongly a community's members feel a deep connection, trust, and respect for one other, transcending their differences and establishing a united social structure. A strong community cohesion is characterized by a shared understanding of its standards, customs, and goals and a willingness to work together. Unity and collaboration among rural community members promote a sense of togetherness (Atkinson et al., 2020), enable collaborative efforts (Daley, 2009), and improve group wellbeing (Ziersch et al., 2020). It fosters safety, flexibility, and life satisfaction by providing support, appreciation, and a sense of belonging to the group (Ratcliffe, 2012). Thus, rural communities can improve their wellbeing and achieve sustainable development by encouraging community unity through inclusive strategies, community-led activities, and a shared purpose.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: Community infrastructure assessment assesses the quality, accessibility, and adequacy of physical infrastructure in rural areas. This includes roads, bridges, public transit, utilities, communication systems, and public amenities. Essential services, economic activity, and rural quality of life depend on strong and well-maintained infrastructure (Mcshane, 2006). Infrastructure issues can impede resource availability, mobility, and economic growth (Atkociuniene et al., 2015). Community infrastructure evaluation identifies gaps, prioritizes infrastructure needs, and informs investment decisions to ensure rural communities have the physical underpinnings they need to prosper and meet resident needs. Policymakers and stakeholders can reduce inequities, promote sustainable development, and improve rural settings by upgrading community infrastructure.

Sustainable Local Governance: Sustainable local governance is crucial for community wellbeing in rural areas. This complex construct includes local governance systems' effectiveness, transparency, and responsiveness in supporting sustainable development and meeting rural community demands (Mcewan, 2003). Local governments can encourage stakeholder participation, make inclusive decisions, and create policies that balance economic, social, and environmental factors (Chong-Min, 2006) Sustainable local governance supports community empowerment, resource management, and quality-of-life efforts (Fontan Jean-Marc et al., 2009) It builds trust,

accountability, and legitimacy between governmental entities and rural residents, increasing the community's social fabric and collective wellbeing. Thus, communities with strong sustainable local government processes may overcome obstacles, use resources, and work toward long-term welfare and resilience.

Table II: Factor Loadings

Items Included in the Exploratory Factor Analysis	Factor loadings
Factors 1: Perceived safety	
I feel safe to walk alone in the street at night	0.871
I feel safe to be alone at home during the night	0.878
I feel safe to leave the car in the street at night	0.753
I feel safe to walk alone in the street during the day	0.726
Factor 2: Social Cohesion	
I often speak on the phone with my neighbors	0.812
I often visit to my neighbor's home	0.793
I often go out with my neighbors	0.766
I often talk to my neighbors outside my home	0.658
Factor 3: Environmental amenities	
I feel satisfied with the space for parking in this area	0.792
I feel satisfied with the cleanliness in my area	0.791
I feel satisfied with the quality of water being supplied in this area	0.708
Factor 4: Community support	
I feel satisfied with the facilities of the child care	0.774
Ifeel satisfied with the services offered to elders	0.732
I feel satisfied with the sports and leisure infrastructure in my area	0.695
Factor 5: Community cohesion	
I am emotionally attached to this area	0.793
I will please to come back to this area	0.759
I am proud to live in this area	0.63
Factor 6: Community Infrastructure Assessment	
I feel satisfied with the availability of medical services in my area	0.764
I feel satisfied with the quality of schools	0.717
I am satisfied with public transport in my area	0.713
Factor 7: Sustainable Local Governance	
I feel satisfied with the local panchayat ghar	0.832
I feel satisfied with the supply of electricity in my area	0.773

Source: Authors Compilation

Relationship between Entrepreneurial Intentions and Community wellbeing in rural areas:

The logistic regression analysis was conducted to examine the factors influencing the Entrepreneurial intentions (dependent variable). The prediction potential of the model was evaluated by the application of various statistical tests. The Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients yielded a chi-square value of 64.383 with 7 degrees of freedom ($p < .001$). This indicates that the logistic regression model, which includes the predictors, is statistically significant and provides a more accurate fit to the data compared to the baseline model without predictors. This is supported by the highly significant p-value (Sig. = 0.000) for all three rows. The Cox & Snell R-squared value of 0.149 indicates that the model accounts for approximately 14.9% of the variability in the data. Conversely, the Nagelkerke R-squared, which modifies the range of the statistic to be between 0 and 1, achieved a value of 0.149. This indicates that 20% of the variability in the dependent variable can be attributed to the combined effects of the predictors. The model's adequacy in fitting the data was verified by the non-significant outcome of the Hosmer and Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test ($\chi2(8) = 12.696$, $p = 0.123$), indicating that the predicted probabilities from the complete model did not significantly deviate from the observed probabilities. Upon meticulous examination of each predictor in the factors in the Equation table, several factors were identified as statistically significant contributors to the model: The results of the statistical analysis show that the odds of the outcome (dependent variable) rise by 7.6% for every one unit increase in PS, while all other variables are kept constant. This relationship is supported by a statistically significant B value of 0.074, a Wald $\chi2$ value of 5.682, a p-value of 0.017, and an Exp(B) value of 1.076. At a significance level of 0.05, the coefficient is statistically significant. The statistical analysis shows that when all other variables are held constant, a one-unit increase in SC is associated with a 12.6% increase in the probability of the result. This relationship is supported by the statistical significance of the coefficient ($B = 0.118$, Wald $\chi2 = 10.734$, $p = 0.001$, $Exp(B) = 1.126$). At a significance level of 0.01, the coefficient is statistically significant. The estimated odds ratio (Exp(B)) for the effect of CSS on the likelihood of the outcome is 0.982 ($p = 0.666$, Wald $\chi2 = 0.187$, $B = 0.018$). Holding all other factors constant, a one-unit increase in CSS is associated with a 20.6% increase in the likelihood of the result. Even at the level of 0.001, the coefficient has a high level of statistical significance. The coefficient of CC ($B = 0.108$) was found to be statistically significant (Wald $\chi2 = 4.689$, $p = 0.030$). Being all the other factors constant, a one-unit increase in CC is associated with an 11.5% increase in the likelihood of the result ($Exp(B) = 1.115$). At a significance level of 0.05, the coefficient is statistically significant. The coefficient for CIA ($B = -0.092$) in the regression model indicates that holding all other variables constant, a one-unit increase in CIA is associated with an 8.8% decrease in the odds of the outcome. This relationship is statistically significant (Wald $\chi2 = 4.534$, $p = 0.033$). At a significance level of 0.05, the coefficient is statistically significant. After controlling for other predictor factors, the statistical analysis shows that the coefficient for SLGS is not significant at the 0.05 level. This suggests that SLGS does not have a noticeable impact on the outcome. The results confirm the efficacy of the model in elucidating the key factors that impact the connection between entrepreneurial goals and community wellbeing in rural areas.

Table III: Logistic Regression				
Variable	B	S.E.	Sig.(p)	Exp(B)odds Ratio
Perceived Safety (PS)	0.07	0.03	0.01	1.07
Social Cohesion (SC)	0.11	0.06	0.00	1.12
Environmental Amenities (EA)	-0.01	0.04	0.66	0.98
Community Support (CS)	0.18	0.04	0.00	1.20
Community Cohesion (CC)	0.18	0.05	0.03	1.11
Community Infrastructure Assessment (CIA)	-0.09	0.04	0.03	0.91
Sustainable Local Governance (SLG)	0.01	0.05	0.83	1.01
Constant	-4.35	0.91	0.00	0.01
a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: PS, SC, EA, CS, CC, CIA, SLG.				

Source: Authors Compilation

Table IV: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

			Chi-square	df	Sig.
		Step	64.383	7	0
		Block	64.383	7	0
		Model	64.383	7	0

Source: Authors Compilation

Table V: Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	12.696	8	0.123

Source: Authors Compilation

Discussion and Implications

The present study endeavoured to elucidate the relationship between community wellbeing indicators and entrepreneurial intentions in rural areas. The findings yielded by the Exploratory Factor Analysis followed by logistic regression analysis offer substantive insights and contribute to the extant literature on community wellbeing and its association with entrepreneurial intentions in rural settings. The results unequivocally demonstrate that the full model, encompassing an array of community wellbeing factors, exhibited a statistically significant improvement in predictive capability over the null model ($\chi2(7) = 64.383$, $p < .001$). This finding underscores the profound influence that the contextual background of a community exerts on the propensity of its members to pursue entrepreneurial intentions. The model's robust predictive performance, as evinced by the appreciable pseudo-R-squared values (Cox & Snell R2 = 0.149, Nagelkerke R2 = 0.200), attests to the explanatory power of the community wellbeing predictors in accounting for variations in entrepreneurial intentions. Examining the specific factors that influence entrepreneurial intentions in rural areas, the study finds that perceived safety, social cohesiveness, environmental amenities, community cohesion, community infrastructure, and sustainable local governance all play a vital role. These findings align with previous theoretical and empirical research that suggests a conducive community environment that is favorable, abundant in resources, opportunities, and supportive networks, might act as a catalyst for the growth of entrepreneurial intentions. By illuminating the interconnectedness between community wellbeing and entrepreneurial goals, it is possible to create targeted interventions that promote an environment conducive to entrepreneurial activities. Community cohesion, which is the most important factor, can be enhanced by implementing initiatives that also strengthen community infrastructure and social cohesion. Perceived safety is the second least important factor that enables individuals to transform their entrepreneurial intentions into actual business ventures.

On the other hand, the lack of strong connections between environmental amenities and sustainable local governance with entrepreneurial aims allows for closer examination. These particular aspects of community wellbeing may have indirect or muted impacts, or they may exert their influence through complicated, non-linear relationships that are not accounted for in the current model. Future research projects could investigate other modelling methodologies to untangle these intricate processes. The research can also conduct longitudinal or comparative assessments comparing various rural regions to observe how changes in community wellbeing over time affect the objectives and outcomes of entrepreneurship. To summarize, this research has contributed to the expanding knowledge of the factors that influence entrepreneurial tendencies by emphasizing the significant role of community wellbeing. The findings emphasize the importance of implementing a holistic approach that integrates economic development strategies with efforts to enhance the overall quality of life in local communities.

Limitations

Notwithstanding the insightful information this study offered, several limitations need to be acknowledged. Moreover, community wellbeing's operationalization as a multidimensional construct calls for caution in interpretation because different cultural and geographic contexts may have different relative importance for its constituent components. The study only collects data at one point in time; its cross-sectional design limits the capacity to conclude the causal linkages between entrepreneurial intentions and community wellbeing. Furthermore, respondents may misrepresent their entrepreneurial intentions due to social desirability bias, which can affect self-reported measures. These limitations might be overcome in future studies by utilizing longitudinal designs, and a wider range of sample strategies to verify self-reported data. However, the study concentrated on rural communities in the Jammu region, its conclusions could not apply to metropolitan environments or other regions with distinct socioeconomic circumstances. More varied sampling strategies should be explored in future studies to incorporate a larger variety of respondents and situations.

Future studies could also use longitudinal designs to monitor changes in community wellbeing and entrepreneurial inclinations over time in order to overcome these constraints and provide a more thorough knowledge of the relationship between the two. Furthermore, the integration of objective metrics and external data sources may aid in the verification of self-reported data and mitigate the influence of social desirability bias. Extending the geographic breadth might improve the findings' generalizability and offer a more complete picture of the connection between entrepreneurial intentions and community wellbeing in various contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Allik, M., & Kearns, A. (2017). "There goes the fear": Feelings of safety at home and in the neighborhood: The role of personal, social, and service factors. Journal of Community Psychology, 45(4), 543–563. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21875
2. Aruqaj, B. (2023). An integrated approach to the conceptualisation and measurement of social cohesion. Social Indicators Research, 168(1–3), 227–263. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-023-03110-z
3. Ashari, H., Abbas, I., Abdul-Talib, A. N., & Mohd Zamani, S. N. (2022). Entrepreneurship and sustainable development goals: A multigroup analysis of the moderating effects of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intention. Sustainability, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010431
4. Atkinson, S., Bagnall, A. M., Corcoran, R., South, J., & Curtis, S. (2020). Being well together: Individual subjective and community wellbeing. Journal of Happiness Studies, 21(5), 1903–1921. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00146-2
5. Atkociuniene, V., Vaznoniene, G., & Pakeltiene, R. (2015). Structural transformations in business development aimed at the development of rural social infrastructure: A sustainable community. Transformations in Business & Economics, 14(2B), 440–455.
6. Barba-Sánchez, V., Salinero, Y., & Estévez, P. J. (2021). Monetising the social value of inclusive entrepreneurship: The case of the Abono Café social economy enterprise. CIRIEC-España, Revista de Economía Pública, Social y Cooperativa, 101, 115–141. https://doi.org/10.7203/CIRIEC-E.101.18158
7. Bhagat, R., Walia, S. S., Sharma, K., Singh, R., Singh, G., & Hossain, A. (2024). The integrated farming system is an environmentally friendly and cost-effective approach to the sustainability of agri-food systems in the modern era of the changing climate: A comprehensive review. Food and Energy Security, 13(1), e534. https://doi.org/10.1002/fes3.534
8. Binns, H. J., Forman, J. A., Karr, C. J., Osterhoudt, K., Paulson, J. A., Roberts, J. R., Sandel, M. T., & Council on Environmental Health. (2009). The built environment: Designing communities to promote physical activity in children. Pediatrics, 123(6), 1591–1598. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-0750
9. Campos Navarrete, M., & Zohar, A. (2021). Rethinking sustainable development by following Indigenous approaches to community wellbeing. Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/25729861.2021.1946315
10. Chataway, M. L. (2020). Sense of place and feelings of safety: Examining young adults' experiences of their local environment using mobile surveys. City & Community, 19(3), 656–675. https://doi.org/10.1111/cico.12453
11. Christakopoulou, S., Dawson, J., & Gari, A. (2001). The community well-being questionnaire: Theoretical context and initial assessment of its reliability and validity. Social Indicators Research, 56(3), 319–349.
12. Contreras-Barraza, N., Acuña-Duran, E., Oyanedel, J. C., Salazar-Sepúlveda, G., Vega-Muñoz, A., & Ariza-Montes, A. (2022). Well-being and entrepreneurship intention: An empirical study of new perspectives. Sustainability, 14(7), 3935. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14073935
13. Daley, C. (2009). Exploring community connections: Community cohesion and refugee integration at a local level. Community Development Journal, 44(2), 158–171. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsm026
14. Dijkhuizen, J., Gorgievski, M., van Veldhoven, M., & Schalk, R. (2018). Well-being, personal success and business performance among entrepreneurs: A two-wave study. Journal of Happiness Studies, 19(8), 2187–2204. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9914-6
15. Fontan, J.-M., Hamel, P., Morin, R., & Shragge, E. (2009). Community organizations and local governance in a metropolitan region. Urban Affairs Review, 44(6), 832–857. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087408326901
16. Forjaz, M. J., Prieto-Flores, M. E., Ayala, A., Rodríguez-Blázquez, C., Fernández-Mayoralas, G., Rojo-Pérez, F., & Martínez-Martín, P. (2011). Measurement properties of the Community Wellbeing Index in older adults. Quality of Life Research, 20(5), 733–743. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-010-9794-2
17. French, S., Wood, L., Foster, S. A., Giles-Corti, B., Frank, L., & Learnihan, V. (2014). Sense of community and its association with the neighborhood built environment. Environment and Behavior, 46(6), 677–697. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916512469098
18. González-Serrano, M. H., Valantine, I., Hervás, J. C., Pérez-Campos, C., & Moreno, F. C. (2018). Sports university education and entrepreneurial intentions: A comparison between Spain and Lithuania. Education + Training, 60(5), 389–405. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-12-2017-0205
19. Harraka, M. (2002). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community, by Robert D. Putnam. Journal of Catholic Education, 6(2), 249–252. https://doi.org/10.15365/joce.0602122013

20. Haslam, S. A., Fong, P., Haslam, C., & Cruwys, T. (2023). Connecting to community: A social identity approach to neighborhood mental health. Personality and Social Psychology Review. https://doi.org/10.1177/10888683231216136

21. Long, E., Stevens, S., Topciu, R., Williams, A. J., Taylor, T. J., & Morrissey, K. (2022). Wellbeing and social network characteristics in rural communities: Findings from a cohort in social housing in Cornwall, United Kingdom. International Journal of Community Well-Being, 5(3), 559–570. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42413-022-00167-5

22. Maskey, R., Fei, J., & Nguyen, H. O. (2018). Use of exploratory factor analysis in maritime research. Asian Journal of Shipping and Logistics, 34(2), 91–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajsl.2018.06.006

23. Masoomi, H., & van de Lindt, J. W. (2019). Community-resilience-based design of the built environment. ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part A: Civil Engineering, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.1061/AJRUA6.0000998

24. McCabe, A., Keast, R., & Brown, K. (2006). Community engagement: Towards community as governance. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Engaging Communities (pp. 1–16). Brisbane, Australia.

25. McCrea, R., Walton, A., & Leonard, R. (2014). A conceptual framework for investigating community wellbeing and resilience. Rural Society, 23(3), 270–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/10371656.2014.11082070

26. McEwan, C. (2003). Bringing government to the people: Women, local governance and community participation in South Africa. Geoforum, 34(4), 469–481. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(03)00050-2

27. McShane, I. (2006). Social value and the management of community infrastructure. Australian Journal of Public Administration, 65(4), 82–96.

28. Molinillo, S., Anaya-Sánchez, R., & Liébana-Cabanillas, F. (2020). Analyzing the effect of social support and community factors on customer engagement and its impact on loyalty behaviors toward social commerce websites. Computers in Human Behavior, 108, 105980. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.04.004

29. Nuclear Waste Management Organization. (2010). Community well-being: An overview of the concept. Nuclear Waste Management Organization.

30. Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Developing a community support model for tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 38(3), 964–988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.01.017

31. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). How's life? 2023: Measuring well-being. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/507433b0-en

32. Panelli, R., Little, J., & Kraack, A. (2004). A community issue? Rural women's feelings of safety and fear in New Zealand. Gender, Place & Culture, 11(3), 445–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369042000258730

33. Park, C.-M. (2006). Local governance and community power in Korea. Korea Journal, 46(4), 9–32.

34. Peters, I., Handley, T., Oakley, K., Lutkin, S., & Perkins, D. (2019). Social determinants of psychological wellness for children and adolescents in rural NSW. BMC Public Health, 19(1), 1616. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7961-0

35. Peters, M., Kallmuenzer, A., & Buhalis, D. (2019). Hospitality entrepreneurs managing quality of life and business growth. Current Issues in Tourism, 22(16), 2014–2033. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1437122

36. Puddifoot, J. E. (1995). Dimensions of community identity. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 5(5), 357–370.

37. Ratcliffe, P. (2012). Community cohesion: Reflections on a flawed paradigm. Critical Social Policy, 32(2), 262–281. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018311430455

38. Rice, B., Boccia, D., Carter, D. J., Weiner, R., Letsela, L., de Wit, M., Pursell, R., et al. (2022). Health and wellbeing needs and priorities in mining host communities in South Africa: A mixed-methods approach for identifying key SDG3 targets. BMC Public Health, 22(1), 120. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-12348-6

39. Rothon, C., Goodwin, L., & Stansfeld, S. (2012). Family social support, community social capital and adolescents' mental health and educational outcomes: A longitudinal study in England. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 47(5), 697–709. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-011-0391-7

40. Shahdadi, A. (2016). Citizens' security feeling and physical factors in communal spaces: Case study of Bandar Abbas City, Iran. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.21859/AJLSR-0401034

41. Sirgy, M. J. (2021). The psychology of quality of life: Wellbeing and positive mental health (3rd ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71888-6

42. Sirgy, M. J., & Cornwell, T. (2001). Further validation of the Sirgy et al.'s measure of community quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 56(2), 125–143.

43. Strange, M., Johnson, J., Showalter, D., & Klein, R. (2012). Why rural matters 2011–12: The condition of rural education in the 50 states. Rural School and Community Trust.

44. Vieno, A., Santinello, M., Pastore, M., & Perkins, D. D. (2007). Social support, sense of community in school, and self-efficacy as resources during early adolescence: An integrative model. American Journal of Community Psychology, 39(1–2), 177–190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9095-2

45. Ziersch, A., Miller, E., Baak, M., & Mwanri, L. (2020). Integration and social determinants of health and wellbeing for people from refugee backgrounds resettled in a rural town in South Australia: A qualitative study. BMC Public Health, 20(1), 1700. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09724-z.

..