

DISABILITY-INCLUSIVE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

¹Istiarsyah, ²Zakeus Dadi

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Mahakarya Aceh, ²Sekolah Tinggi Pertanian Kewirausahaan Banau

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: [September, 2026]

Revised: [September, 2026]

Accepted: [September, 2026]

Available Online: [September, 30 2026]

Keywords

Disability-inclusive entrepreneurship;
Sustainable livelihoods; Persons with
disabilities; Inclusive entrepreneurship;
Financial inclusion

DOI

Corresponding Author:

Name: Istiarsyah

Institution Address: Universitas
Muhammadiyah Mahakarya Aceh

e-mail: istiarsyah@ummah.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship has increasingly been promoted as a pathway for enhancing the economic participation, autonomy, and social inclusion of persons with disabilities. However, entrepreneurial participation does not necessarily result in secure or sustainable livelihoods, particularly when disabled entrepreneurs continue to face financial, institutional, technological, and social barriers. This study conducts a systematic literature review to synthesize existing knowledge on disability-inclusive entrepreneurship and its relationship with sustainable livelihood outcomes. Following the PRISMA 2020 framework, 15 peer-reviewed Scopus-indexed studies published between 2009 and 2026 were systematically identified, screened, and analyzed. The selected studies were examined through thematic and narrative synthesis, focusing on entrepreneurial motivations, individual capabilities, social and relational resources, financial inclusion, institutional accessibility, and livelihood outcomes. The findings reveal four major themes: entrepreneurship as a response to labor-market exclusion and a pathway to autonomy; the role of entrepreneurial capabilities and resilience; the importance of social networks and mentoring; and the critical influence of financial and institutional inclusion. The review further identifies a central tension: entrepreneurship can enhance flexibility, self-determination, and job satisfaction while still producing unstable income, limited business growth, and persistent economic vulnerability. Accordingly, sustainable disability-inclusive entrepreneurship depends not only on individual entrepreneurial agency but also on accessible finance, supportive institutions, social capital, reasonable accommodations, and inclusive entrepreneurial ecosystems. This review contributes by repositioning disability entrepreneurship from a narrow self-employment perspective toward a multidimensional sustainable livelihood framework and proposes directions for future research on resilience, business continuity, intersectionality, digital entrepreneurship, and long-term livelihood security.

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



A. INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship has increasingly been recognized as an alternative pathway for advancing the economic participation of persons with disabilities, particularly in contexts where conventional labor markets remain characterized by accessibility barriers, discrimination, inflexible work arrangements, and limited opportunities for career advancement. Unlike standard wage employment, entrepreneurship can provide greater autonomy over working

hours, workplace design, task allocation, and the adaptation of work to individual functional needs. Early evidence from European countries indicates that persons with disabilities are relatively more likely to enter self-employment and may experience greater satisfaction with their jobs and working conditions because of the flexibility associated with entrepreneurial work (Pagán, 2009). Entrepreneurship has therefore been positioned not only as an employment alternative but also as a potential mechanism through which persons with disabilities can strengthen economic agency and social participation (Maritz & Laferriere, 2016). Nevertheless, entry into entrepreneurship does not necessarily translate into the successful establishment of a viable enterprise. Evidence shows that nascent entrepreneurs with disabilities encounter particular difficulties in transforming entrepreneurial activity into sustainable organizations, highlighting an important distinction between entering self-employment and achieving durable economic outcomes (Renko et al., 2016).

This distinction is particularly important because entrepreneurship among persons with disabilities occurs within an environment shaped by multiple and often interconnected constraints. Limited access to start-up capital, inaccessible infrastructure and technologies, inadequate business-development services, negative social attitudes, weak institutional support, and restricted access to entrepreneurial networks can significantly affect both business creation and subsequent growth. At the individual and social levels, mentoring, social support, persistence, flexibility, access to equipment, and financial resources can facilitate entrepreneurial participation, whereas discrimination and the absence of formal support may inhibit it (Balcazar et al., 2023). More recent research further demonstrates that institutional arrangements can continue to constrain disabled entrepreneurs even after a business has been established, particularly through inaccessible funding systems, insufficiently tailored business advice, and difficulties obtaining appropriate workplace adjustments (Holland et al., 2025). Evidence from public-service research similarly indicates that regulatory commitments to inclusion often fail to translate into accessible practice (Istiaryah & Fauzan, 2026). Importantly, entrepreneurship should therefore not be assumed to provide an automatic economic remedy for labor-market exclusion. Recent evidence indicates that although entrepreneurs with disabilities may report higher levels of non-pecuniary job satisfaction, they can simultaneously experience substantial earnings disadvantages, suggesting that autonomy and work satisfaction do not necessarily correspond to financial security (Chung & Yu, 2026). These findings challenge simplistic assumptions that entrepreneurial participation itself constitutes successful economic inclusion.

Such tensions indicate the need to examine disability-inclusive entrepreneurship through the broader perspective of sustainable livelihoods. From this perspective, entrepreneurial success should extend beyond business entry, business ownership, or short-term income generation to include the capacity to maintain stable sources of livelihood, absorb economic and social shocks, exercise meaningful economic autonomy, access productive resources, and sustain participation in economic and community life over time. This distinction is particularly relevant for persons with disabilities because entrepreneurial activities are frequently embedded within structural conditions that influence access to finance, assistive technologies, markets, education, social protection, and institutional support. Recent work on disability-inclusive entrepreneurship emphasizes that isolated interventions such as entrepreneurship training or microcredit may be insufficient when financial institutions, digital systems, social protection mechanisms, and market structures remain inaccessible (Bechange et al., 2026). Consequently, sustainable entrepreneurial livelihoods are better understood as the outcome of interactions among individual capabilities, social resources, financial inclusion, institutional accessibility, and entrepreneurial ecosystem support, rather than solely as a function of individual entrepreneurial motivation. This perspective redirects attention from the question of whether persons with disabilities become entrepreneurs toward the more consequential question of under what conditions entrepreneurship can generate resilient, inclusive, and sustainable livelihoods.

Despite growing interest in disability entrepreneurship, the literature remains fragmented. Mota et al. (2020) reviewed 42 studies focusing on disabled entrepreneurs, self-employment, barriers, and education and training, while Sodhi and Dwivedi (2024) analyzed 130 publications and confirmed that the field remains relatively dispersed. Existing studies largely emphasize entrepreneurial entry, motivations, barriers, self-employment, training, and support, with less attention to long-term livelihood outcomes such as income stability, business continuity, resilience, autonomy, and

social inclusion. Moreover, the relationships among individual capabilities, social networks, financial access, institutional support, and sustainable livelihoods remain insufficiently integrated.

Accordingly, this study conducts a systematic literature review of disability-inclusive entrepreneurship and sustainable livelihoods. It identifies major research themes and theoretical perspectives, examines factors enabling or constraining entrepreneurship among persons with disabilities, assesses its contribution to sustainable livelihood outcomes, and highlights future research gaps. The study contributes by linking disability entrepreneurship with the sustainable livelihoods perspective and integrating individual resources, social networks, financial inclusion, institutional accessibility, and ecosystem support into a multidimensional framework. This approach provides a broader understanding of how entrepreneurship can support economic autonomy, resilience, inclusion, and sustainable livelihoods among persons with disabilities.

B. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a systematic literature review (SLR) to synthesize research on disability-inclusive entrepreneurship and sustainable livelihoods. The review followed PRISMA 2020 to ensure transparency and methodological rigor in study identification, screening, eligibility assessment, and inclusion. Scopus was used as the primary database because of its broad coverage of business, economics, social sciences, psychology, and interdisciplinary research. The search combined three domains—disability, entrepreneurship, and sustainable livelihood outcomes. The search included English-language peer-reviewed articles and reviews without geographical restrictions.

Studies were included when they examined persons with disabilities in relation to entrepreneurship, self-employment, microenterprise, or business ownership and reported outcomes related to economic participation, income, resilience, autonomy, financial inclusion, business sustainability, or social inclusion. Studies were excluded when disability was only mentioned incidentally, entrepreneurship was not a central focus, or the publication lacked sufficient theoretical or empirical relevance. The screening process resulted in a final analytical sample of 15 documents, which were subsequently analyzed to identify the main themes, enabling factors, barriers, and sustainable livelihood outcomes associated with disability-inclusive entrepreneurship.

Table 1. Research Criteria

Criterion	Inclusion	Exclusion
Database	Scopus	Records not identifiable through the defined Scopus search strategy
Publication type	Peer-reviewed journal articles and review articles	Conference abstracts, book reviews, editorials, notes, dissertations, and non-peer-reviewed publications
Language	English	Non-English publications
Population	Persons with disabilities, disabled entrepreneurs, or entrepreneurs with disabilities	Studies without an identifiable disability population
Main phenomenon	Entrepreneurship, self-employment, microenterprise, or business ownership	General employment studies without an entrepreneurial component
Outcome relevance	Income, livelihood, resilience, autonomy, financial inclusion, economic participation, social inclusion, business sustainability, or related outcomes	Studies without relevance to entrepreneurial or livelihood outcomes
Subject relevance	Business, economics, management, social sciences, psychology, disability studies, and related interdisciplinary fields	Studies outside the conceptual scope of the review
Full-text availability	Sufficient information available for substantive analysis	Records with insufficient information for meaningful synthesis

Study selection followed the PRISMA 2020 stages of identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion, resulting in a final sample of 15 articles. Studies were considered relevant when they addressed at least one dimension of sustainable livelihoods within disability entrepreneurship, even without explicitly using the term sustainable livelihood. Data were extracted on study characteristics, methods, barriers, enabling factors, and livelihood-related outcomes, then analyzed using deductive and inductive coding. Given the heterogeneity of the studies, thematic and narrative synthesis was applied to identify four main dimensions: individual capabilities, social and relational resources, financial and institutional inclusion, and sustainable livelihood outcomes. Cross-study comparison was used to identify recurring patterns, contextual differences, and research gaps related to disability-inclusive entrepreneurship.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Overview of the Selected Literature

The systematic review identified 15 studies published between 2009 and 2026, showing a gradual shift in disability entrepreneurship research. Earlier work emphasized self-employment as an alternative to conventional employment, particularly in terms of flexibility and job satisfaction (Pagán, 2009). Later studies expanded toward entrepreneurial entry, competencies, resilience, financial access, identity, and institutional barriers (Ashley & Graf, 2018; Balcazar et al., 2023; Hidegh et al., 2023; Holland et al., 2025; Renko et al., 2016). More recent research increasingly addresses economic sustainability, inclusive finance, social protection, and the long-term viability of entrepreneurial livelihoods.

Methodologically, the literature includes quantitative, qualitative, empirical, and review-based studies, reflecting the multidimensional nature of disability entrepreneurship. Existing reviews highlight recurring issues such as barriers, education and training, motivations, support, networks, and financial resources (Avellone et al., 2023; Mota et al., 2020; Norstedt & Germundsson, 2023; Sodhi & Dwivedi, 2024).

2. Entrepreneurship as a Response to Labor-Market Exclusion and a Pathway to Autonomy

The first major theme highlights entrepreneurship as both an opportunity and a response to exclusion from conventional employment. Persons with disabilities may choose entrepreneurship because it offers greater control over working time, location, workload, and workplace adaptation. Pagán, (2009) found that self-employed persons with disabilities in Europe reported relatively favorable job and working-condition satisfaction. However, entrepreneurship is not always opportunity-driven. Norstedt and Germundsson (2023) identified recurring motivations related to economic necessity, flexibility and self-determination, avoidance of discrimination, and personal development, indicating that entrepreneurial participation often reflects both pull and push factors.

This distinction is important because autonomy does not necessarily guarantee business sustainability. Renko et al. (2016) found that entrepreneurial efforts among persons with disabilities were less likely to develop into viable organizations, suggesting that willingness to become self-employed is different from the capacity to sustain a business. Structural disadvantages such as limited finance, weak professional networks, inaccessible support, and discrimination may continue after business entry. From a sustainable livelihoods perspective, autonomy is therefore necessary but insufficient; sustainable entrepreneurship also requires adequate income, business continuity, financial resilience, and access to productive resources.

3. Individual Capabilities, Competencies, and Resilience

The second theme emphasizes the role of personal capabilities and resilience in entrepreneurial participation among persons with disabilities. Competencies, persistence, creativity, adaptability, motivation, and confidence can support entrepreneurial agency and socioeconomic participation. Ortiz García and Olaz Capitán (2021) highlight that entrepreneurial competencies contribute not only to autonomy but also to broader social value, while Pérez-Macías et al. (2022) identify resilience as an important factor in entrepreneurial intention and the ability to cope with disability-specific and business-related challenges.

However, personal capabilities alone do not guarantee sustainable entrepreneurial outcomes. Balcazar et al. (2023) found that creativity, persistence, flexibility, and independence operate alongside access to finance, equipment,

mentoring, and social support. This suggests that capability should not be separated from enabling conditions. Even highly motivated and resilient entrepreneurs may struggle when financial systems, business support, technologies, or markets remain inaccessible. Therefore, sustainable livelihoods are better explained by the interaction between entrepreneurial capability and an enabling environment, rather than by individual resilience alone.

4. Social Networks, Mentoring, and Relational Resources

The third theme highlights the importance of social networks and relational resources in disability-inclusive entrepreneurship. Disabled entrepreneurs often depend on networks for information, mentoring, emotional support, referrals, and access to business resources. Balcazar et al. (2023) identified social support and mentoring as key facilitators of business creation, while Avellone et al. (2023) emphasized networks, financial resources, work experience, interagency collaboration, and business-plan support in shaping self-employment outcomes. Holland et al. (2025) further showed that peer support and tailored guidance become especially important when formal business services are inaccessible. These findings indicate that social capital provides informational, instrumental, and psychosocial benefits, but excessive reliance on informal networks may also reflect weaknesses in mainstream entrepreneurial institutions. Therefore, social networks should function as part of an inclusive entrepreneurial infrastructure that connects disabled entrepreneurs to finance, technology, markets, and broader economic opportunities.

5. Financial and Institutional Inclusion as Structural Conditions

Access to financial and institutional resources is one of the most persistent constraints on sustainable disability-inclusive entrepreneurship. Financial barriers affect start-up capital, technology investment, working capital, business expansion, and workplace adaptation. Mota et al. (2020) identified entrepreneurial barriers as a major theme in the literature and showed that these constraints arise from interacting personal, social, and political conditions rather than individual limitations alone. Holland et al. (2025) similarly found that disabled entrepreneurs may face negative attitudes from funders, restricted financing options, inaccessible application procedures, and limited understanding from service providers. These findings highlight the importance of distinguishing between formal availability and substantive accessibility, because support programs may exist without being genuinely usable by persons with disabilities.

This challenge is especially significant in low-resource settings. Bechange et al. (2026) showed that young people with disabilities in Sub-Saharan Africa remain vulnerable because of inaccessible finance, educational exclusion, weak asset accumulation, social stigma, risky borrowing, and unstable markets. Their findings suggest that isolated interventions such as training or microcredit are insufficient without accessible financial services, social protection, inclusive institutions, and market opportunities. Therefore, disability-inclusive entrepreneurship should be understood through an ecosystem perspective, where financial inclusion, institutional accessibility, reasonable accommodations, training, social protection, and market participation operate together to support viable and sustainable enterprises.

Institutional accessibility also extends beyond financial services to the wider public-service environment on which disabled entrepreneurs depend. Istiarsyah and Fauzan (2026), in a literature review of inclusive policy implementation in Indonesian public services, argue that physical, digital, and social accessibility remain insufficient for reaching vulnerable groups, including persons with disabilities, even where equality-oriented regulations already exist. They further show that public participation often remains symbolic rather than exerting substantive influence on policy, and that social justice requires affirmative policy design, multi-stakeholder involvement, and a shift toward more adaptive and humanistic bureaucratic governance. Although their analysis does not focus specifically on entrepreneurship, it is relevant to the present review because enterprise-related information, administrative procedures, and support services are commonly delivered through public institutions. Where these channels are inaccessible, disabled entrepreneurs may encounter barriers even before they approach finance or mentoring. This reinforces the argument that sustainable disability-inclusive entrepreneurship depends not only on individual capability but also on accessible institutions and participatory policy ecosystems.

6. Intersectionality and the Heterogeneity of Disability Entrepreneurship

Another important finding is that persons with disabilities should not be treated as a homogeneous entrepreneurial group, since disability interacts with gender, age, socioeconomic status, education, geographical context, and other identity dimensions. Hidegh et al. (2023) showed that entrepreneurial identity is shaped by the intersection of disability and gender, including responses to ableist and gendered expectations. Similarly, Avellone et al. (2023) identified disability, gender, race, and age as factors influencing self-employment outcomes. These findings indicate that entrepreneurship programs and livelihood pathways should account for differences in functional needs, access to technology, family resources, labor-market experience, and exposure to discrimination. Future research should therefore move beyond simple disabled–non-disabled comparisons and examine within-group variation in how support mechanisms operate across different institutional and business contexts.

7. Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Livelihood Outcomes: A Conditional Relationship

The most important finding of this review is that entrepreneurship has a conditional rather than automatically positive relationship with sustainable livelihoods. Pagán (2009), Norstedt and Germundsson (2023), and Holland et al. (2025) show that entrepreneurship can improve flexibility, autonomy, self-determination, confidence, and well-being among persons with disabilities. However, these benefits do not necessarily translate into economic sustainability. Renko et al. (2016) found that disabled entrepreneurs may struggle to develop viable businesses, while Chung and Yu (2026) reported that higher non-financial satisfaction can coexist with an earnings disadvantage.

These findings indicate that entrepreneurship may enhance autonomy without guaranteeing income security. Sustainable livelihoods should therefore be assessed through multiple dimensions, including stable income, business continuity, access to capital, autonomy, well-being, social participation, and resilience to financial or institutional shocks. Because these outcomes may develop differently, sustainable livelihood is better understood as a multidimensional outcome rather than a single measure of self-employment or business participation.

8. Research Gaps and Future Research Directions

Several research gaps emerge from the review. Existing studies still focus heavily on entrepreneurial motivations, intentions, entry, and barriers, while longitudinal evidence on business survival, income growth, asset accumulation, and livelihood resilience remain limited. Future research should therefore assess sustainable livelihood outcomes more comprehensively by combining enterprise performance with income security, autonomy, well-being, social participation, and resilience. Greater attention is also needed to institutional and ecosystem interactions, particularly how finance, mentoring, accessibility, social protection, and business support work together to shape entrepreneurial outcomes.

Further research should strengthen intersectional and comparative perspectives by examining differences across disability type, gender, age, socioeconomic status, education, geography, and digital access. More evidence is also needed from emerging and developing economies, where financial systems, social protection, and market conditions may differ substantially. Digital entrepreneurship should become another priority, as e-commerce, fintech, remote work, and assistive technologies may reduce some accessibility barriers while creating new forms of exclusion.

Digital inclusion may be an important mechanism in this respect. Istiarsyah et al. (2026), in a quantitative study of 108 respondents involved in social enterprises across Indonesia, found that digital inclusion, reflected in access to digital technologies, digital skills, and digital participation, had a positive effect on both social value creation and community resilience, with social value creation partially mediating this relationship. Although their study does not focus specifically on persons with disabilities, the findings suggest that digital access and skills can strengthen the capacity of enterprises to generate social value and, in turn, the adaptive capacity of the communities they serve. For disability-inclusive entrepreneurship, this implies that digital entrepreneurship should be examined not only as a means of reducing physical and mobility barriers but also as a potential resilience-building pathway, provided that digital infrastructure, assistive technologies, and digital skills are genuinely accessible. Future studies should therefore test

whether comparable mechanisms operate among entrepreneurs with disabilities and whether digital inclusion contributes to business continuity and long-term livelihood resilience.

D. CONCLUSION

This systematic literature review synthesizes 15 Scopus-indexed studies published between 2009 and 2026 and concludes that disability-inclusive entrepreneurship can enhance flexibility, autonomy, self-determination, and economic participation, but does not automatically generate sustainable livelihoods. Its long-term contribution depends on whether entrepreneurial activity produces stable income, business continuity, resilience, well-being, and social inclusion. These outcomes are shaped by the interaction of individual capabilities, social capital, accessible finance, institutional support, technology, reasonable accommodations, and entrepreneurial ecosystem conditions. The review therefore shifts attention from entrepreneurial entry toward the quality and sustainability of livelihood outcomes. Future research should strengthen longitudinal, intersectional, comparative, and digital entrepreneurship perspectives, while policy should move beyond promoting business creation alone toward creating inclusive conditions that enable persons with disabilities to establish, sustain, and develop resilient and economically viable enterprises.

REFERENCES

- Ashley, D., & Graf, N. M. (2018). The Process and Experiences of Self-Employment Among People With Disabilities: A Qualitative Study. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 61(2), 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355216687712>
- Avellone, L., Malouf, E., Taylor, J. P., & Whittenburg, H. (2023). An international scoping review of factors impacting self-employment outcomes for individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 59(1), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-230024>
- Balcazar, F. E., Murthy, S., Gibbons, T. M., Sefandonakis, A., Renko, M., Parker Harris, S., & Caldwell, K. (2023). Supports and barriers that entrepreneurs with disabilities encounter when starting their businesses. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 68(1), 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rep0000479>
- Bechange, S., Jolley, E., Muuo, S., Pente, V., & Schmidt, E. (2026). Disability, entrepreneurship, and inclusive finance: reimagining livelihood pathways for young people in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Development in Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2026.2697239>
- Chung, S. H. D., & Yu, N. (2026). Is entrepreneurship an economic remedy for people with disabilities? Evidence on earnings and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 25, e00590. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2025.e00590>
- Hidegh, A. L., Svastics, C., Csillag, S., & Györi, Z. (2023). The intersectional identity work of entrepreneurs with disabilities: constructing difference through disability, gender, and entrepreneurship. *Culture and Organization*, 29(3), 226–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2023.2201006>
- Holland, P., Molyneux, C., & Winstanley, J. (2025). Navigating serial inequities: the unmet support needs of disabled entrepreneurs. *Disability & Society*, 40(10), 2680–2702. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2025.2450529>
- Istiarsyah, I., & Fauzan, F. (2026). Implementasi Kebijakan Inklusif dalam Pelayanan Publik bagi Kelompok Rentan: Kajian Pustaka tentang Aksesibilitas, Partisipasi, dan Keadilan Sosial bagi Penyandang Disabilitas dan Kelompok Marginal. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 3(6), 270–280. <https://injoqast.net/index.php/ADIMEN/article/view/760>
- Istiarsyah, I., Sandria, W., Saidang, S., Perwithasari, R., & Untari, I. (2026). Digital Inclusion and Community Resilience: The Mediating Role of Social Value Creation in Social Enterprises. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Impact Economics*, 1(1), 11–25. <https://badrionpress.com/index.php/jseie/article/view/6>
- Maritz, A., & Laferriere, R. (2016). Entrepreneurship and self-employment for people with disabilities. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 25(2), 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1038416216658044>
- Mota, I., Marques, C., & Sacramento, O. (2020). Handicaps and new opportunity businesses: what do we (not) know about disabled entrepreneurs? *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 14(3), 321–347. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-12-2019-0120>

- Norstedt, M., & Germundsson, P. (2023). Motives for entrepreneurship and establishing one's own business among people with disabilities: Findings from a scoping review. *Disability & Society*, 38(2), 247–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2021.1919504>
- Ortiz García, P., & Olaz Capitán, Á. J. (2021). Entrepreneurship for People With Disabilities: From Skills to Social Value. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 699833. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.699833>
- Pagán, R. (2009). Self-employment among people with disabilities: evidence for Europe. *Disability & Society*, 24(2), 217–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687590802652504>
- Pérez-Macías, N., Fernández-Fernández, J. L., & Rúa Vieites, A. (2022). Resilience and entrepreneurial intentions of people with disabilities: in search of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *F1000Research*, 11, 726. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.113565.1>
- Renko, M., Parker Harris, S., & Caldwell, K. (2016). Entrepreneurial entry by people with disabilities. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(5), 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242615579112>
- Sodhi, S., & Dwivedi, A. K. (2024). Differently Abled Entrepreneurs: A Systematic Literature Review on Fifty Years of Research—Exploring Thoughts and Debate with Reference to Entrepreneurship. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 33(1), 183–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09713557241234022>