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ABSTRACT
This article presents findings from interviews with Indonesian villagers who limited access to quality education. To minimise this educational disadvantage, a village community of entrepreneurship was designed to help improve villagers’ socio-economic capitals and empower villagers to become entrepreneurs. An exploratory study of this intervention programme was enacted to identify whether this village community of entrepreneurship helped build villagers’ entrepreneurial literacy. Findings showed the village community of entrepreneurship provided villagers with a space for learning entrepreneurship, and the villagers had informal educational opportunities. The villagers also reported that their heightened awareness of entrepreneurship could build their entrepreneurial literacy. It was also found that the programme improved the welfare of rural communities. The article concludes by recommending how this model may be adapted and adopted for rural communities worldwide seeking to create learning communities to improve literacy and reduce poverty.
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Introduction
“Education for sustainable development” puts emphasis on holistic and transformational education that exerts influence on countries’ sustainable development (Beka, 2015; Kopnina & Meijers, 2014). The United Nations’ sustainable development goals establish quality education as one of seventeen agenda objectives formulated to ensure all may have the opportunity to experience long-life learning (Mashau et al., 2017; Siivonen, 2016). Globally, the aim is for every citizen to receive equal access to quality education, become fully literate, and view education as a long-term investment that can enhance individuals’ quality of life (Connor, 2014; Ibrahim, Arshad, Salleh, & Ibrahim, 2017; Nordlund, Stehlik, & Strandh, 2013).

Access to quality education services for children differs by country (Dubey, 2010). Countries adopt strategies to enhance the quality of education programmes that may minimise school dropout rates (Cameron, 2009; No, Taniguchi, & Hirakawa, 2016). As reported by UNESCO (2010–2015), 260 million school-age children in 128 countries had limited access to education and education services require improvement to address school dropout rates. Quality education services (Greylting, 2009; Köseleci, 2016) include easy access to learning locations, learning materials, learning facilities, and infrastructure,
low transportation cost, and professional teaching staff (Muthanna, 2015). Like other Asian countries, in Indonesia, the right to have quality education is spelled out in the opening Act of the Constitution of 1945: “… the Indonesia Government protects all Indonesian citizens and all Indonesian territories as well as promotes public welfare through education.” In reality, however, Indonesian citizens, particularly school-age children, have unequal access to education and difficulty attending formal education because of geographic barriers (e.g. mountains, rivers, forests, and islands) and a lack of transportation facilities among other reasons, resulting in high dropout rates. As reported by UNICEF in 2016, 2.5 million Indonesian children lacked access to advanced education, including approximately 600 thousand primary school children and 1.9 million junior high school students.

High dropout rates are problems for rural communities globally (Kotwal, Kotwal, & Rani, 2018; Scales, 2016). Governments, policymakers, educators, and communities have trialed several efforts to provide access to school-age children for further education. Examples include promoting a “house” not just as a place to live, but also a location that can serve communities for gathering and learning. Prior research has indicated that it is important for students who cannot continue their studies into tertiary education to join study groups because this facilitates entrepreneurship and independence (Paço, Ferreira, & Raposo, 2016). Entrepreneurial behaviour relates to a social context where challenges exist between businessmen and instructional approaches. In addition, digital media are utilised to develop communication with audiences as practice strategies and co-creation brand practices facilitate business development (Horst, Järventie-thesleff, Perez-latre, Järventie-thesleff, & Perez-latre, 2019). Such concepts are not yet applicable in Indonesia due to varied abilities, targets, and insufficient facilities.

An entrepreneurship learning strategy is proposed, with the concept that a “House of Entrepreneurship” is worthy of research examination because learners are village community members with limited access to formal education. “The House of Entrepreneurship” proposes training, case studies, and workshops where all learning materials are designed to mediate or facilitate a learning process, encourage learners’ motivation, and build learning discipline. Patience, learning outcomes, and commitment are also encouraged (Perks & Longman, 1985). Although access to technology can facilitate learning processes in a House of Entrepreneurship (Mittelmeier, Rienties, Rogaten, Gunter, & Raghuram, 2019), rural Indonesia is an environment without internet access which necessitates rural people to engage in entrepreneurial activities that can be directly learned and applied at home.

Entrepreneurial literacy is a key factor for changing rural community members’ mindsets to achieve independence, creativity, discipline, and foster a desire to move forward and be empowered (Fatoki & Fatoki, 2017), as well as develop entrepreneurial ventures in rural communities (Kumpulainen, 2018; Philip & Williams, 2018) and be proud of creating income-generating activities (Bhansing, Hitters, & Wijngaarden, 2018; Feldman, 2014). While business capital is needed, changing rural mindsets to be more creative encourages economic independence and poverty reduction (Grimes, 2000; Peredo & Moore, 2008; Salemink, Strijker, & Bosworth, 2017). Entrepreneurship literacy research reports little empirical evidence detailing how a house can serve as a centre for building entrepreneurship literacy in rural communities where young people have limited access to further education. Thus, the goal of the present study is to document how a rural
community in Indonesia can build their entrepreneurship literacy where a house serves as a platform for learning. The research includes learning processes, methods, and media rural community members experienced and adopted, empirically documenting how entrepreneurship literacy is situated in a rural community. Findings give fresh insights into a learning community of practice situated in rural areas not only in Indonesia, but also in other Asian contexts and beyond where rural communities struggle to learn formally and to live amidst their economic hardship.

Literature review & theory

Rural communities and village-based entrepreneurship

In rural communities, the term “village” can be used to describe a social network where people are actively and regularly involved in a myriad of routine social encounters where they enact different social roles, such as farmers, teachers, merchants, and other occupations, and perform community services. As a socio-cultural and institutional territory, villages can enable members to fulfil their basic needs and make contributions to other communities. In most developing countries, agriculture is the primary sector where villagers grow, distribute, and consume agricultural products, requiring a village planning strategy for sustaining agricultural cycles (Davitt, Lehning, Scharlach, & Greenfield, 2015; Wu & Robinson, 2015). “Rural entrepreneurship” is not only an economic process, it is also a social process requiring creativity and innovation in understanding opportunities, organising resources, and managing production so a business is able to generate profit or increase value over a long period of time (Lønning, 2018). Providing micro assistance for entrepreneurship, is found, however, to decrease entrepreneurs’ satisfaction because of the high level of solicitudes (Bhuiyan & Ivlevs, 2019).

Providing quality education and training in rural areas may prevent villagers from migrating to cities. Building an entrepreneurial spirit in “rural communities of practice” consists of three value transformations: (1) time-related (2) individual action, and (3) social-relations (Sabar & Pagis, 2015). An entrepreneurial spirit can be nurtured with market-based training programmes adopting a participatory approach (Messerli & Abdy-kaparov, 2008), where industries and higher education institutions play an agentive role in training/educating villagers in rural entrepreneurship and evaluation of its effectivity (Matricano & Formica, 2017). Entrepreneurship education has been shown to significantly impact rural communities’ economies (Al-Dajani & Marlow, 2013), prompting policymakers, academics, and entrepreneurs to support the cultivation of productive thinking, interpersonal skills, leadership, and motivation which contributes to entrepreneurial competencies (Rezaeizadeh, Hogan, Reilly, Cunningham, & Hogan, 2016).

Entrepreneurial literacy

In innovative teaching and pedagogy, the design of multiple literacies requires a transformative process. (Multi)literacy allows people to integrate knowledge, values, and skills (Kim & Xing, 2019). (Multi)literacy programmes aim for literacy knowledge and skills that can be easily applied across situations and social contexts, with literacy practices socially built to minimise inequality and inspire social change (Corus & Ozanne, 2011;
Topper & Topper, 2008). (Multi)literacy educators support skill and knowledge development by creating literacy-oriented settings inside and outside the classroom as well as build community-based literacy practices. Research recommends literacy policymakers and educators develop partnerships with different communities of practice (around coordination, communication, planning, execution, and evaluation) so that target community members can gain meaningful learning experiences (Dhara Dharamshi, 2019; Petrone, 2013). Financial literacy is part of entrepreneurial literacy. It is defined as knowledge, attitudes, skills, and abilities that guide complex financial markets, empowering individuals to make responsible financial decisions and identify social risks (Ayhan, 2018). In low-income rural communities, financial literacy can help community members create income-generating activities/innovations that can create new markets serving low-income young people in developing countries (Sinha, 2013). Entrepreneurship literacy supports individuals to learn about markets by utilising social skills, connecting entrepreneurial educational content to life experience as part of lifelong learning (Viswanathan, Gajendiran, & Venkatesan, 2008). Entrepreneurship literacy practitioners play a crucial role in training and educating rural community members to take self-responsibility for their own professional identities (Clair, Maclachlan, & Tett, 2017).

Houses as a social space for learning

“Home” is an emotive word and the term “homely” conjures up different cultural images (Lewinson, 2015). A house can be a place, a space, a sense of homeliness, and a social identity (Fleming & Kydd, 2018). A house is not just a place to live, but functions as a place to gather within a community, or neighbourhood. Learning experiences can be obtained not only in classrooms, but also in neighbourhoods or home learning environments (HLE) (Cahoon, Cassidy, & Simms, 2017; Niklas, Cohrssen, & Tayler, 2018). In Indonesia, for instance, many children and young people have a limited access to formal education or formal learning. Utilising houses as social spaces for providing learning opportunities, nurturing entrepreneurial spirit, and, in turn, entrepreneurship literacy means family and community members can learn together. Building an entrepreneurial “community of practice” may allow income-generating activities taking a participatory approach. This article researches a participatory entrepreneurial community of practice in Indonesia, arguing it can stimulate critical dialogue among community members, building awareness of individual perspectives, perceptions, and different viewpoints.

Methods

Research aims, researcher standpoint and research questions

Reilly’s (2010) participatory case study research method was chosen because it supported involving local community members in the entire research process. The research design sought to improve the knowledge and skills of participants. Research participation was viewed as a way of empowering local community members to learn about entrepreneurship, specifically the benefits of using their houses as a social place for building and
developing entrepreneurial activities. The researchers are positioned as outsiders and insiders, first acting as outsiders to engage one local community of practice called the “House of Entrepreneurship” where local community members or villages built and develop their entrepreneurial activities. As the local community members viewed us as insiders, we not only collected data, but also empowered research participants to develop their entrepreneurial literacy. The core question expanding existing research literature this article addresses is: What impact did the House of Entrepreneurship have for village community members and their entrepreneurial literacy?

**Research setting, sampling, and participant demographics**

Before the research commenced, community leaders were contacted to negotiate and discuss access for data collection and entrepreneurial experience and knowledge sharing. One centre was chosen as the research site because it is a central community-based institution in an informal sector. The centre’s goals aligned with the research aim, to create a House of Entrepreneurship that empowers local community members or villages to carry out independent entrepreneurship activities and facilitates entrepreneurial learning initiatives by local people (Journal, Toutain, Fayolle, Pittaway, & Politis, 2017). The centre was established in December 2014 under the supervision of the local Board of Education. One programme the centre regularly implements is creating home-based learning communities initiated and run by married women. The centre successfully created five learning communities, each consisting of 10 young and middle-aged married women (aged 25–40) who completed primary and junior high school and had experience in traditional businesses, such as making and selling banana crackers, cakes, and food to serve daily needs. All learning community members were recruited and agreed/gave permission to participate voluntarily in the research. Two research purposes/benefits briefings were conducted. Further, recruitment included five tutors (3 males and 2 females) having between 5 and 20 years of training experience in the area of entrepreneurship and a Bachelor of Informal Education. Tutors’ life experience skills included managing culinary business, home industries, and information communication technology.

**Intervention programme**

The research included an intervention programme initiated as part of the community outreach programmes organised by the affiliated university which had a partnership with the centre. The training focus was to enhance community members’ entrepreneurship literacy so they could improve their entrepreneurial ventures. Tutors were recruited, with 1–3 tutors assigned to become mentors for each learning community. The researchers supervised all tutors involved until completion of the programme. As part of the intervention programme, a needs analysis of local community members’ knowledge and experience of entrepreneurship was undertaken using conversational interviews. Findings from the needs’ analysis supported the entrepreneurship literacy materials’ design, adopting andragogy that put emphasis on taking a case study, problem-solving, and self-directed learning approach so local community members could put what they learned from a series of workshops into practice. Next, a series of workshops
on entrepreneurship literacy were conducted. These brought what local community members encountered in the field into the workshops, which also emphasised how to create entrepreneurship networks using social media. Digital literacy skills development helped local community members market their products. Upon completion of the programme, an evaluation was implemented where community members reflected on the following items (Table 1):

**Table 1. A guide to self-evaluation of entrepreneurship literacy learning process.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutors explained the purpose of learning entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Tutors applied different learning strategies</td>
<td>Tutors made use of materials available in the environment as media for entrepreneurial practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors demonstrated sensitivity and were open, flexible to the student</td>
<td>Tutors applied andragogy principles</td>
<td>Tutors used PowerPoint media, videos, and other digital technologies to enact the learning materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors mastered the learning materials</td>
<td>Tutors encouraged participants to practice learning materials for entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Participants felt the benefits of ICT-based learning since these media were not available in their environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors interacted well with the participants</td>
<td>Tutors took time when learning through role plays</td>
<td>The practice of entrepreneurship could be continued outside the learning (meeting) hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors spent time guiding the participants outside the learning hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors arranged learning meetings regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors administered assessment instrument variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors evaluated the learning process by involving the participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data collection and analysis**

Data were collected through fieldwork observations, interviews, and documentation collected over a span of six months from May to October 2018. All potential participants were asked to read and complete a consent form and were invited to attend a short briefing on the research process. Participants were advised they were free to withdraw from the project (Eick, 2012). The research setting consisted of five learning communities, with multiple observations to document the centre’s operations and how the House of Entrepreneurship ran. Field notes were collected rather than video-recording the centre’s happenings due to ethical concerns. Following the multiple observations, we invited tutors, local community members as learners, and centre managers to discuss their involvement in the centre and we conducted interviews with all participants.

Interviews were undertaken at five time points. All interviews were carried out in Bahasa Indonesia so participants could express their experiences freely using their local language at their convenience. Interview questions covered participants’ learning experiences, challenges they experienced in the field, and actions that could improve their entrepreneurship literacy and entrepreneurship ventures. In addition, all documents created by the tutors and participants were collected for document analysis. All field observations and interviews were transcribed and coded. The transcribed data were sorted for data reduction. Following data reduction, selected data were grouped into categories for in-depth meaning-based analysis. Initially, emergent findings that addressed the research questions were analysed using interpretative content analysis. Participants were asked to confirm the data was correctly interpreted. This member checking was used to increase interpretational validity and trustworthiness. Bahasa
Indonesia data were translated into English to make accessible for international readership and data was connected to relevant literature.

Findings & discussion

**House of Entrepreneurship: existence and potential in the research location**

The House of Entrepreneurship existed in the Indonesian village researched because rural community members sought learning how to become entrepreneurial, despite having limited facilities and living in a remote geographical area that is hardly accessible. Initially oriented towards providing school dropouts with a high school equivalency programme in order to obtain the equivalent of a high school diploma, and then gain employment or commence post-secondary education or training, rural villagers also needed to learn skills to improve their income earning capacity for their family economy. The House of Entrepreneurship was an alternative pathway for rural community members who lacked formal education opportunities. Additionally, the House of Entrepreneurship became a learning centre for those who could not afford formal education, lived in a remote area, and/or did not feel comfortable studying in a formal education institution. Villagers preferred attending the House of Entrepreneurship to formal institutions because it was designed as a learning site where, in a developing country, high dropout rates and geographically inaccessible landscapes contribute to illiteracy rates and poverty. Hence, the House of Entrepreneurship afforded village community members the opportunity to access a high school equivalency programme which may ease being trapped into poverty.

**Village community entrepreneurship literacy development**

Creating several houses of entrepreneurship in village communities aimed to provide rural villagers with practical literacy skills to create and run entrepreneurial activities with local potential. The learning process, media, and methods implemented in the entrepreneurship houses facilitated local community members developing planning, processes, and evaluation skills noted in research literature (Schönfeld, Tan, Wiekens, & Janssen-, 2019).

Informal entrepreneurial learning faces dilemmas and challenges, such as needing a higher awareness of individuals and knowledge that certain economic risks cannot be avoided, yet can be addressed by learning design (Pantea, 2016). Practical learning in the houses of entrepreneurship involved different learning planning processes than formal education. For example, at the planning stage, students were involved. Tutors explained learning objectives and both tutors and learners discussed outcomes of learning objectives in order to reach an agreement. The following interview quote shows one student’s reaction to tutors’ explanations of the learning objectives:

> At the beginning, a tutor explained the objectives of learning entrepreneurship so that we knew what to learn and how to develop our skills in sales/marketing. The tutor also emphasised that the goal of learning entrepreneurship is using social media, such as WhatApps, Instagram, and Facebook, to advertise our agricultural products. Our tutor
also pointed out that the learning of entrepreneurship was how to develop our skills and nicely wrapping … to attract potential buyers.

Tutors gave clear and simple instructions in learners’ mother language, or local dialect, so learners could easily understand explanations. Entrepreneurship literacy was designed based upon learning objectives and learners realised the House of Entrepreneurship goals allowed them to build entrepreneurship literacy. Almost all learners emphasised that raising entrepreneurial awareness was important for sustaining activities so they could produce their own products using local raw materials. For this reason, tutors had to be able to show critical sensitivity to their surroundings and create a good discussion with learners. This was achieved by, for instance, tutors asking questions about learning material design by showing examples of good and bad product packaging using “real world” examples:

Tutor: Does this product have good packaging (or not)?
Learner: The sample product is packed well. Compared to our product, we found that our product is terribly packed. That makes people uninterested to buy the product. We have difficulty selling our product outside our village.

Having seen the real product examples, learners came to understand the importance of product packaging. This was a practical way of explaining how to package products, with the applied outcome that villagers could identify products with nice and attractive packaging after the lesson. Tutors needed not only to deliver the learning materials, but also to build personal relations with students. Although learning sessions were scheduled in the morning, tutors helped villagers learn entrepreneurship literacy outside learning hours, at any time they were free from work. Practical literacy thus had flexible learning times.

Tutors evaluated students’ performance in joining entrepreneurship literacy practices, as shown in Table 2.

The learning process was informed by the andragogy approach, “the art and science of helping adults learn.” This was a narrower approach than the one prevalent in Europe. Knowles’ andragogy is, to some extent, very practically-oriented.

In andragogy methodology, different learning activities, such as lectures, discussions, teamwork and role play were adopted to mediate the entrepreneurial activities occurring in the House of Entrepreneurship. The house was designed as a small market to simulate selling transactions. Villagers could play different roles as a producer, an agent, a distributor, and consumers. Role-playing helped participants understand the subject materials delivered, although this process was time consuming. Thus, the andragogy approach used in the House of Entrepreneurship placed adults as active agents in learning, assuming adults have self-esteem, a self-concept, experiences, readiness to learn, motivation, and a need to know/learning orientation (Mccauley, Hammer, & Hinojosa, 2017). This placed learners as persons with resource, and their learning activities are that which should be appreciated. In this respect, tutors served as another resource. Tutors encouraged participants to create products using local materials or sources from rural communities, such as producing a variety of processed food made from cassavas or bananas. These raw materials were easily found in the area yet often bought cheaply by wholesalers. Hence, the houses of entrepreneurship encouraged and motivated villagers to process agricultural products into products that have market value and sell them directly to consumers at a better price.
Indonesia consists of several community types: urban, coastal, mountainous, forest, and rural communities. The sociological system of rural communities is generally clustered as a family. Most rural community members work as plantation farmers, with some employed outside of agriculture. Indonesian rural communities try to anticipate harvesting failure due to bad weather and pest/disease attacks and have what is called “gotong royong” based upon mutual cooperation. This term is used by people if work needs to be done together, such as repairing broken bridges, cleaning the environment, or organising a wedding ceremony or funeral. The community collectively helps if there exists need for any activity and the assistance can be in the form of manpower, food, or money donated voluntarily. Gotong Royong is a community empowerment programme that emphasises the participation of all people starting from the planning stage to the evaluation by using the power of the community in management (Abdulkadir, Madhakomala, & Idris, 2018). Rural people gather, interact, have the same purpose, learn from each other, and, at last, form a community.

An informal learning community is where learners participate in a community to understand practical knowledge and skills together. “Communities of Interest” is a notion that refers to “groups that are informally formed and based upon shared beliefs, values, and concerns as opposed to locality or social patterns” (Dingyloudi & Strijbos, 2019). The rural community of Sukamakmur Village, West Java, transformed their community as a community learning centre. The learning centre contributed to improving quality of life, increased social capital, and facilitated collective beneficial actions (Tam & Le, 2018). Informal learning centres provide opportunities for the community to learn outside the formal education system, especially for adults and rural community members, and may also be a site of gathering. When asked about the value of the learning centre, all learners in the present study felt happy to gather and learn together, benefiting from learning together in groups, sharing stories, and solving village issues, especially during harvesting failure. Additionally, the learning community improved their knowledge and skills which provided positive examples to young children, adolescents, and early adults by showing everyone has an opportunity to learn regardless of age or educational background.

Adult learning is self-actualisation, supporting self-potency to face the future (Sung, Freebody, Sung, & Freebody, 2017). Direct practical learning formed much of the learning community experiences. A practice community “focuses on sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Tutors’ Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Active in asking a question, active participation, mastering initial subject materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Enjoy asking questions, sometimes get confused in understanding the subject materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Quiet, not open, but creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Very enthusiastic, show good teamwork, good at solving a case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Active in asking questions, mastering the materials even though having no entrepreneurship experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caring, active in asking questions, be enthusiastic in mastering the materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Willing to cooperate in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Quiet, shy to ask, a lack of confidence but have ability in creating a local product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Easy to understand the materials, create a warm learning condition by being friendly and making jokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Like to joke during discussion but attentive in listening to the materials explained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning communities in Indonesia**

| Table 2. Observation report of students’ entrepreneurship literacy practice. |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| **Student**               | **Tutors’ Evaluations**     |
| A                         | Active in asking a question, active participation, mastering initial subject materials |
| B                         | Enjoy asking questions, sometimes get confused in understanding the subject materials |
| C                         | Quiet, not open, but creative |
| D                         | Very enthusiastic, show good teamwork, good at solving a case study |
| E                         | Active in asking questions, mastering the materials even though having no entrepreneurship experience |
| F                         | Caring, active in asking questions, be enthusiastic in mastering the materials |
| G                         | Willing to cooperate in learning |
| H                         | Quiet, shy to ask, a lack of confidence but have ability in creating a local product |
| I                         | Easy to understand the materials, create a warm learning condition by being friendly and making jokes |
| J                         | Like to joke during discussion but attentive in listening to the materials explained |

**RURAL SOCIETY**
best practices and new knowledge to advance professional practices as a result of the engagement of all agents and the involvement of all elements of their systemic but complex nature” (Terzieva, 2016). A community has the particular purpose shared by people with a similar purpose. Despite the benefits of the houses of entrepreneurship, as learning centres they have limited facilities, low budgets, and lack facilitators. Nevertheless, these shortcomings were not an obstacle for rural groups carrying out learning activities. The village community felt so glad about the existence of the learning community that it built houses of entrepreneurship as learning centres where people could gather and role model a supporting learning environment for their children.

The House of Entrepreneurship is a social site of learning intended for increasing the knowledge and skills of rural communities. Such houses open opportunities for community members to gain education due to limited educational institutions, learning centres and/or low levels of community income. Figure 1 presents a model for improving rural community knowledge and skill development through informal learning.

This model can be used by rural communities worldwide that have similar problems and characteristics to help improve the knowledge, skills, and family economy in villages by learning at entrepreneurship houses and carrying out entrepreneurship practices. Universities, as knowledge developers, may contribute by providing materials and learning media tailored to learners’ needs, while governments play a crucial role in facilitating rural communities through the enactment of product policies, giving business licenses, administering product patents, helping venture capital, promoting products, and providing free training programmes.

**Conclusions**

Rural houses can function as learning spaces, offering a solution for developing countries with mobility and transportation problems due to inaccessible geographical landscapes. Areas where it is difficult for community members to access formal education have high rates of school dropout and illiteracy. A lack of knowledge and skills contributes to poverty, trapping rural community members into a circle of poverty which could be reduced by educating people, providing them with knowledge and skills that will afford opportunities to find or create better jobs. Learning communities have a specific goal of gathering people or groups of people that have similar purposes. The houses of entrepreneurship in this study served as learning centres of the communities, overcoming limitations in facilities and geographical location which have been an obstacle for learners to keep learning.

Communities play important roles in the development of a country. Thus, the development of human resources must be prioritised. Knowledge and skills can be obtained from various sources, either through formal education or through non-formal education. Learning for adults is a self-actualisation, a process of developing self-potency to face the future (Sung et al., 2017). For this reason, a House of Entrepreneurship can serve as a site of community-based learning that enables rural people to enhance their entrepreneurship knowledges, skills, and literacy. An entrepreneurship literacy practice in rural communities can be interpreted as a learning process with the learners’ direct involvement in determining the learning objectives and preparing lesson plans. Subject materials are
delivered in a simple way using simple terminology to make it easy for learners to comprehend. Such a community-based learning practice focuses on sharing best practices and new knowledge to advance individuals’ professional practice as a result of their engagement. The involvement of all elements of their systemic but complex nature (Terzieva, 2016).

People may assume that knowledge and skills can only be obtained through formal education, courses and training institutions provided by government or private institutions. Houses of Entrepreneurship, however, contribute to village communities by advancing their knowledge and skills of entrepreneurship gained from their living environment, create practical entrepreneurship learning, and learning communities originating from students’ initiatives. The creation of learning communities helps solve various problems faced by rural people. The success of entrepreneurial houses is due to community involvement and participation. Future research may develop the model offered for urban and coastal communities and create suitable learning materials that fit the needs of specific rural community characteristics.
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