International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management
United Kingdom ISSN 2348 0386 Vol. IX, Issue 8, Aug 2021

http://ijecm.co.uk/

FACTORS INFLUENCING SUSTAINABLE ENTREPRENEURIAL PRACTICES: LOOKING AT EXTERNAL FACTORS THROUGH CONVENTIONAL ENTREPRENEURIAL PERSPECTIVES

Sharif Hossain
Associate Lecturer, Arden University
Arden House, Middlemarch Park,
Coventry, CV3 4FJ, United Kingdom
msharif2009@yahoo.com

Abstract

Although entrepreneurs make significant social and economic contributions to the economy with their entrepreneurial activities, they create negative impacts on the environment as well. However, entrepreneurs can turn various social and environmental problems into fruitful solutions to benefit society and ensure the long-term prosperity of their businesses and this is called sustainable entrepreneurship. A question can, therefore, arise that what external factors can influence entrepreneurs to engage in sustainable entrepreneurial activities. This research aims to highlight contextual or external factors that can influence on entrepreneurs' decision to engage in sustainable entrepreneurial activities. Screening through key relevant publications, this theoretical paper, therefore, reviewed and integrated existing literature to highlight contextual factors that can influence entrepreneurs to engage in sustainable entrepreneurial practices. This paper opens key considerations for researchers in the sustainable entrepreneurship field to further explore contextual factors and enhance understanding.

Keywords: Sustainable entrepreneurship, influencing factors, sustainability, entrepreneurship

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship contributes to economic and non-economic development by creating jobs, improving products and processes, establishing new business firms, and changing people's lives (Hernandez, 2010). At the same time, entrepreneurial activities cause serious market failures that reduce the environment's quality (Cohen and Winn, 2007; Hockerts and Wuestenhagen, 2010). It is essential to find better ways to deal with social and environmental issues such as the negative impact of global warming, mass unemployment and overutilisation of scarce and renewable sources as these problems remained unresolved (Cohen and Winn, 2007; Kuckertz and Wagner, 2010; Dean and McMullen, 2007; Hockerts and Wuestenhagen, 2010).

Hockerts and Wustenhagen (2010) suggested that sustainable entrepreneurship can be considered as a unique perspective, which can accumulate economic, social and environmental value for future generations. In other words, sustainable entrepreneurship is about achieving three objectives - commitment towards social welfare and long-term sustainability of the environment for the next generations, as well as generating profit. Entrepreneurs, therefore, can contribute to this challenging situation by turning social and environmental problems into business opportunities, as well as benefitting themselves. For that reason, researchers have demonstrated how the entrepreneurship concept can be a fruitful solution for sustainable development issues because prominent innovations that have a great contribution to sustainable development mostly originate from entrepreneurial ventures (Kuckertz and Wagner, 2010).

To develop understanding of and facilitate sustainable entrepreneurial activities, it is essential to understand what contextual factors can influence entrepreneurs to engage in sustainable entrepreneurship. Sustainable entrepreneurship is a relatively new area of research and, therefore, an integrative approach is considered for this paper to review existing literature on the topic area. This approach would enable to summarize and synthesise entrepreneurship and sustainable entrepreneurship literature relating to contextual factors that can influence entrepreneurs undertaking sustainable entrepreneurship. It is important to clarify that contextual factor, in this paper, refers to various economic, social, environmental and background factors that can influence entrepreneurs in undertaking sustainable entrepreneurship. These factors are critically reviewed below in this paper.

FAMILY BUSINESS BACKGROUND

Literature about the impact of family business backgrounds on entrepreneurial inclination can be taken into account, since sustainable entrepreneurial propensity and traditional entrepreneurial propensity both based on the philosophy of inclination to start a business. Entrepreneurship scholars such as Dyer's theory of entrepreneurial careers (1994) and Katz's model of employment status choice (1992) have tried to conceptualise entrepreneurial career development. Katz (1992) proposed that the key antecedents, such as role model or family business background, influence entrepreneurial career choice. Dyer (1994) made it clear by saying that individuals grow up with their families observing what their parents or grandparents do and, thus, that is embedded in them and is reflected in their future activities.

In this regard, Keat et al., (2011) can also be mentioned, as they state that a family's business background and demographic characteristics have an influence on entrepreneurial inclination. Conducting their study on students, they found that those who had self-employed mothers were mostly inclined towards entrepreneurial activities. This may be because mothers play an important role in bringing up their children and this creates a good parent-child relationship. Ullah et al., (2011) also supported this idea, stating that parents demonstrating entrepreneurial behaviour enable their children to behave entrepreneurially and act with strong entrepreneurial orientation, compared to those whose parents are employment oriented. This may be because business-oriented parents are a strong inspiration to their children because of the independent nature of business orientation embedded in them from their childhood.

In contrast, Hisrich (2008) looked at the phenomenon from a different perspective and argued that in order for entrepreneurial attitudes, entrepreneurial self-efficacy is important, but there is no significant impact of family background - such as parent and grandparent influence - on entrepreneurial attitudes and entrepreneurial self-efficiency. Hisrich (2008) may have identified that disagreement because of the difficulties of transferring natural instinct from one family member to another. In support of that, Goksel and Aydintan (2011) also did not find any significant influence of family business background on entrepreneurial propensity, which contrasts with Keat et al., (2011) and Ullah et al., (2011).

In the F-PEC model, however, Astrachan et al., (2002) demonstrated that there are three dimensions of family influence on enterprise: the power (ownership, management and governance), experience (contributions of the family to the businesses) and culture (overlap between business and family values, and commitment to the family business). The family influence of all dimensions may influence sustainable entrepreneurial activities because Huang et al., (2009) stated that family businesses are generally more socially responsible compared to non-family businesses. In addition, Woodfield et al., (2017) proposed that sustainable entrepreneurship could be a new avenue for family business researchers to examine. The F-PEC model can be further discussed in the aspect of sustainable entrepreneurship below:

Firstly, family members who are on the management board and advocate sustainability value could direct or lead other members to engage in sustainable entrepreneurship; for example, Gunawan and Dhewanto (2012) found that the family value of care for the environment influences entrepreneurs to adopt eco-friendly initiatives. Their study was, however, only conducted in Indonesia with five family businesses, which may be considered as inapplicable to other societies as a whole. In addition, in contrast to this, Jansson et al., (2017) did not identify any relationship between the sustainability values of management and sustainability commitment.

Secondly, an individual advocating sustainability values and with experience of sustainable activities can influence other members of the family to incorporate sustainable activities or create new sustainable ventures. This can be said because Hockerts (2017) found that prior experience with social organisations can predict social entrepreneurial intention.

Thirdly, in a cultural dimension, it is reasonable to assume that in a family business, the manager or owner would consider the views and opinions of other members of the family (Huang et al., 2009) who advocate sustainable values and want to incorporate them into their businesses. In other words, managers promoting sustainability values can direct other family members towards sustainability by using their power of persuasion. An individual with experience of sustainable activities can influence and assist in incorporating sustainability into an organisation, and a family member with sustainability as a goal can influence the management team to engage in sustainable activities.

EDUCATION AND SUSTAINABLE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Entrepreneurship researchers have identified the importance of entrepreneurship education as an influencing factor of an individual's entrepreneurial activities; for example, Kuttim et al., (2013) explained that politicians and higher education institutions have a growing interest in entrepreneurship education as it contributes to the development of a student's entrepreneurial inclination. They conducted a cross-section study collecting data from 17 European economies and identified that the entrepreneurship education positively influences entrepreneurship. Keat et al., (2011) conducted a research on Malaysian students and identified that there are significant association between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention. They have added that the reason for such results can be seen as being down to the university providing a friendly environment in encouraging and fostering entrepreneurial behaviour.

In disagreement with the researchers mentioned above, some researchers have not identified any positive association between entrepreneurs' participation in entrepreneurship development programmes and entrepreneurial propensity; for example, Wu and Wu (2008) conducted study on Chinese students and found that there is no significant relationship between participation in an entrepreneurship curriculum and entrepreneurial propensity. Fayolle et al., (2006) have also not identified any significant impact of student's participation in entrepreneurial education on entrepreneurial propensity.

By applying the social cognitive theory of Wood and Bandura (1989), however, it can be said that sustainable entrepreneurship education could strengthen an individual's entrepreneurial efficacy in many ways. Firstly, sustainable entrepreneurial education would offer opportunities to individuals to engage themselves repeatedly in sustainable activities and increase their level of confidence to perform such activities successfully in the future. Secondly, sustainable entrepreneurship education would assist to meet sustainable role models (guest speakers) and encouraged to engage in sustainable activities. Thirdly, it would persuade them from feedbacks given by others, from class discussions, and coursework about sustainable activities. Other researchers have also tried to investigate the impact of education on self-efficacy perception; for example, Hattab (2014) found no effects of education on a student's self-efficacy because self-efficacy is the confidence which can successfully engage entrepreneurial behaviour and, in their study, entrepreneurship education did not have a positive influence on entrepreneurial competencies. On the other hand, Shinnar et al., (2014) investigated to see how the role of entrepreneurship education could impact on entrepreneurial self-efficacy. The study was conducted on students twice; once at the beginning of the semester and once at the end. In contrast to Hattab (2014), their study found that students' entrepreneurial self-efficacy increased after entrepreneurial education. Similarly, sustainable education can also increase the sustainable entrepreneurial self-efficacy of entrepreneurs.

The importance of education on sustainable entrepreneurial inclination is significant, as Hattab (2014) stated that entrepreneurship can be taught and a student's desire for self-employment increases with acquired knowledge; for example, Safari et al., (2014) suggests that environmental education is an important experience that is able to change an individual's lifestyle. They further added that the goal of environmental education is to enable a person to make a conscious decision about future generations because of its impact on an individual's future behaviour. Sarker and Goutam (2015) also stated that green efforts, such as energy conservation and environmentally responsible behaviour, contribute to sustainable education and the adoption of sustainable behaviour. Arogundade (2011) also stressed the importance of entrepreneurship education to sustainable development.

Lourenco et al., (2012) argued that business schools have the opportunities to develop a sustainability curriculum in a positive way which can also be influential for students in building morality and responsibility. Sarker and Goutam (2015) believed that business schools can work as a catalyst between sustainable education and the student with the introduction of green culture in the curriculum, techniques and materials. They have, therefore, proposed that business schools can adopt a systematic approach towards promoting sustainable entrepreneurship education, such as nurturing a sustainable business culture, in order to raise awareness of the opportunities arising from environmentally friendly business models, and creating an environment that promotes and encourages green investment. Ghoshal (2005) argued, however, that profit generation and materialistic worldviews are prescribed by business schools, which can compromise an individual's ethical values and weaken their perception of social responsibility. The researcher further described the intention of business schools as a 'profit first' mentality, where there is no consideration of social responsibilities.

GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

In any country, the government employs rules and regulations for businesses through its laws and policies. According to Dean and McMullen (2007), a government can provide much needed resources within its capacity since it is leading the sustainable development in any country. Traditional entrepreneurship researchers, therefore, in their studies, have tried to investigate the political conditions of entrepreneurial development that can be related to the sustainable entrepreneurship literature. Some of those studies indicated that some government policies may be discouraging towards entrepreneurial activities (Ihugba et al., 2014; Friedman, 2011), while other studies showed that government policies positively influence entrepreneurial development (Mason and Brown, 2011; Tende, 2014).

Administrative complicates in government institutions can create barriers to entrepreneurial activities. According to Fogel and Gnyawali (1994), governments have greater options for influencing entrepreneurial activities that could be carried out by removing the barriers that create administrative complications. For example, if an individual wants to start a new venture, they may be discouraged from doing so if they are required to follow layers of rules and procedures and report to a number of institutions, costing more time and money. This can be exemplified with the situation in Brazil where there are 18 bureaucratic steps and several days required to register a business compared to Canada where it takes only one step and a day (Vargas-Hernandez and Noruzi, 2009).

Moreover, Ihugba et al., (2014) performed a study in Nigeria to outline the current and future challenges and perspectives for entrepreneurship development. Their study concluded that businesses experiencing a government's harsh laws and insufficient support are less likely to engage in creating new businesses. In addition, they further highlighted that frequent changes in tax regulations and other commercial laws by government require business managers and government administrations to constantly adjust their knowledge, which may also hinder the entrepreneurial process. As a reason for this, Hernandez (2010) suggested that a lack of training opportunities for government officials prevented the proper implementation of laws and regulations with negative implications for the business environment. In addition, Friedman's (2011) study collected data internationally by World Bank and Global Entrepreneurship Monitor project and their study found that higher regulations and greater taxes create barriers to entry for new businesses in some countries, including Denmark and Finland.

Furthermore, Hernandez (2010) also argued that the legal framework can be one of the main barriers to entrepreneurship activities for an individual. If a state gives little or no protection from other dominating actors, entrepreneurs might fear losing their resources and having their profits taken away. They would, therefore, be less likely to be interested in legitimate entrepreneurial activities (Tende, 2014). Various property laws, bankruptcy, contracts, taxes and commercial activities need an institutional framework with the capacity to employ efficiently (Ihugba et al., 2014). These legal frameworks can create barriers to sustainable entrepreneurship development because sustainable entrepreneurs also need to go through a similar process of entrepreneurship. In addition, many entrepreneurs are reluctant to face such bureaucratic complicacies that could make the situation even more critical for them. In this case, the government could create sustainable entrepreneurial cultures throughout all of its institutions, which would enable businesses to take risks on investing in environmental plans (Hernandez, 2010). In addition, Gandhi et al., (2018) also explained that support from the government is very important for promoting sustainable entrepreneurship.

On the other hand, when a government creates incentives, it influences entrepreneurs to create new ventures. Government policies and procedures can influence entrepreneurial activity by moderating the perception of risks and benefits associated with starting new entrepreneurial ventures (Tende, 2014). Such benefits include tax breaks for businesses, providing consulting resources and offering loans with favourable rates for new venture creation (Mason and Brown, 2011; Tende, 2014). Sine and David (2010) have also found that these initiatives create effects by promoting particular industries and supporting new ventures, possibly including sustainable new ventures.

FINANCIAL AND NON-FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Both financial and non-financial support can equally influence on entrepreneurial activities, therefore, existing literature on these issues are reviewed in this section.

Financial support

Financial capital is associated with the pursuit of entrepreneurship (Kim et al., 2006) and, therefore, accessibility to finance by entrepreneurs has gained attention from academics and policymakers over the last few decades. Evans and Jovanovic, (1989) and Dunn and Holtz-Eakin (2000), mentioned in Petrova (2010), show empirical evidence that entrepreneurs may generally have credit constraints, and those who are able to accumulate start-up capital are highly likely to involve themselves in entrepreneurship. Other researchers, however, have argued that financial capital is not a constraining factor of entrepreneurial activities (Kim et al., 2006). These researchers seem to mean that other necessary elements important for entrepreneurship, such as skills and opportunities, make the necessity of money less important for start-up entrepreneurs.

Fogel and Gnyawali (1994) argued that entrepreneurs require financial assistance in order to spread the start-up risks, accumulate capital at the beginning and expand the business further. Osano and Languitone (2016) found that start-up finances are essential for entrepreneurs to grow in the competitive market and that, without the availability of external finance, new businesses are likely to face barriers. This result is significant and reveals that a poorly functioning financial market can limit the entry of new firms into the business. This is because most new ventures are created with the help of borrowed money or investment from partners or angel investors (Osano and Languitone, 2016). The high level of assistance in investment, therefore, is likely to ensure a high level of entrepreneurial activities.

These investment funds, however, do not often come from private sources, but are rather offered by banks as loans or credit cards. Even though the assistance from financial institutions can boost new venture creation, findings from Petrova (2010) denoted that commercial banks seem to be reluctant to offer support to risky businesses. This could be due to the lack of financial planning, accounting documents, or a high interest rate, which are some of the constraints mentioned by financial institutions limiting the provision of financial products to new businesses, as found by Osano and Languitone (2016) in a study conducted on SMEs in Mozambique.

Moreover, researchers have found that a higher interest rate is negatively correlated with new venture creation. Higher interest rates can contribute to the suppression of entrepreneurial activities by reducing an entrepreneur’s desire to borrow money, thus minimising the likelihood of entrepreneurial activities due to the likely inability of managing expenses (Paulson and Townsend, 2005). Foltz (2004) also found that interest rates charged by banks discourage borrowers from getting business funds from financial institutions to invest in their businesses. Many individuals are, therefore, reluctant to apply for finance from commercial banks but, rather, initially finance their business with their own funds, family funds and friends' funds (Osano and Languitone, 2016).

In terms of sustainable entrepreneurship, this argument can be taken further because sustainable entrepreneurs set the social, environmental, as well as the economic goals, which require sufficient finance to start-up. Availability of enough capital from external or internal sources can, therefore, encourage, or discourage, sustainability-driven individuals to start sustainable entrepreneurial ventures in a similar way to traditional entrepreneurs, which were highlighted in different studies in the social and environment entrepreneurship literature. For example, the difficulties of attracting financial capital experienced by social entrepreneurs were mentioned in Zahra et al., (2009) and Dorado (2006). Moreover, in a large-scale study in the UK, Leahy and Villeneuve-Smith (2009) found that financial barriers are perceived as a strong barrier by social entrepreneurs.

Similarly, researchers highlighted that the value created by environmental entrepreneurs is not appreciated by those making the investment and, therefore, it appears to be less desirable to investors and hinders environmental entrepreneurs in acquiring finance (Dean and McMullen, 2007). Similar results were also identified by Lovell and Smith (2010) who concluded that, in terms of accessing finance, banks appear to have problems with lending money to environmental entrepreneurs owing to the divergent nature of environmental entrepreneurship (different from traditional entrepreneurship).

Non-financial support to businesses

While entrepreneurs need financial assistance, they also require non-financial assistance in a number of areas, including conducting market research, creating business plans and acquiring financial assistance (Monkman, 2010). In this case, business incubators and accelerators can guide businesses to survive and develop. In order to provide a service for start-up businesses, Fogel and Gnyawali (1994) suggested that business incubators could be an efficient way to assist entrepreneurs where insufficient infrastructures exist. In that regard, Mahmood et al., (2016) also argued that business incubators are effective for entrepreneurs in developing countries. Although their study presented the results from a developing country's perspective, they may still be relevant to other countries, since sustainable entrepreneurship is a new phenomenon in any country and, therefore, guidance and assistance from incubators or accelerators can be considered beneficial to transform, or to start, new businesses with a sustainable goal. This is because incubators and accelerators are able to provide direct or indirect resources (Cohen, 2013) in the areas where a gap exists for sustainable entrepreneurs.

Moreover, networking can influence sustainable entrepreneurial actors to engage in sustainable entrepreneurship. Fogel and Gnyawali (1994) mentioned that networking is an important mechanism for enhancing business capability and, therefore, networks established by entrepreneurial fairs, associations, clubs and trade fairs can be an effective non-financial support for entrepreneurs. Networking enables an individual to acquire the resources that are held by others, which improve entrepreneurial effectiveness. This is because potential entrepreneurs acquire knowledge and skills by meeting other individuals with complementary expertise and learn how to approach potential buyers, hire competent employees and access financial support (Minniti, 2005). Similar results were also identified in a study on social entrepreneurship by Partanen et al., (2011) who posited that networks are important for social entrepreneurs in accessing new business opportunities, markets, contracts, suppliers, customers and technology. They further highlighted that networking even helps to attract senior management, employees and government to support at the early stages of businesses. In terms of environmental entrepreneurship, Gibbs and O'Neill (2012) also found that informal business support, especially relationships and networking, is one of the most critical elements of green entrepreneurship. This is because networks of this kind can create opportunities to meet investors and other sustainable entrepreneurs and improve ideas on how sustainable businesses are managed and incorporated.

In addition, infrastructural elements could also have an impact upon entrepreneurial environments. Such infrastructural elements can include the arrangement of university's research and development programmes, broadband facilities, a skilled labour force and modern transport and communication facilities for facilitating easy access to suppliers (Czernich et al., 2011). Audretsch et al., (2015) conducted a longitudinal study in 127 European cities and found that there is a strong association between infrastructure and entrepreneurship, because infrastructure can create linkage that facilitate recognising entrepreneurial opportunities.

In this regard, it can be mentioned that the availability of the internet and connectivity through social media could also facilitate sustainability among entrepreneurs. For example, a recent research conducted by Severo et al., (2019) found that even though people still do not actively search for information on sustainability, those individuals exposed to various forms of information relating to social responsibility and environmental sustainability via social media are positively influenced in forming social and environmental awareness. This means that these individuals are likely to be involved in sustainable entrepreneurial activities at a later stage.

MARKET ORIENTATION

Market orientation is customer-centric view and, in general terms, it means the implementation of marketing concepts in an organisation for strategic success. According to Kohli and Jaworski (1990), market orientation generates market intelligence related to customer needs, spreading that intelligence to all of the departments in the organisation and being responsive to the surroundings. Narver and Salter (1990) defined market orientation as the culture of a business that ensure exceptional performance through its commitment to creating better value for customers with co-ordination across departments. This means that market-oriented entrepreneurs put customers at the centre of their strategy, co-ordinate their employees, with the marketing plans considering external factors. Customer focus means focusing on customer demands and designing strategies to satisfy customers because, without focusing on customers, strategies will not work (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990); it is important, therefore, for an organisation to focus on its customers.

From a sustainability perspective this means designing marketing plans based on the sustainability concept to fulfil customer demand so that long-term organisational benefits are achieved. The existing literature suggests that market orientation has an impact upon engagement in sustainable entrepreneurship (Mitchell et al., 2010; Jansson et al., 2017). In this regard, it should be mentioned that market orientation was studied previously at an organisational level; since operating an organisation requires human interaction, however, the principle of market orientation can be looked at from an entrepreneur's perspective.

Customers are considered to be at the centre of a business' focus and, therefore, customer demand or pressure can have an influence on market-oriented entrepreneurs with regard to adopting sustainable activities in their businesses. Jansson et al., (2017) looked at the market orientation of businesses from a commitment perspective, and their findings suggest that market orientation is related to commitment to sustainability. Several other researchers have suggested the idea that stakeholder or customer pressure can persuade businesses to adopt pro-environmental measures. A study conducted by Agan et al., (2013) on 500 Turkish SMEs identified that customer demand has a great impact on environmental management. Saez-Martinez et al., (2016) conducted a large-scale research project on 3647 SMEs in 38 countries, and their findings show that customer demand significantly influenced the environmental performance of an organisation.

Understanding the importance of the impact of market orientation on sustainable entrepreneurship literature, Mitchell et al., (2010) have proposed the idea of sustainable market orientation and claimed that it will generate an increasing level of corporate confidence among its key stakeholders. Such as customers would stimulate sustainable activities of the organisations and encourage them to perform in economically, socially and environmentally responsible manner. The principle of sustainable market orientation suggests combining market orientation with sustainability, and an entrepreneur with market orientation would feel more responsible towards society and the environment, which would increase the positivity of their reputation (Mitchell et al., 2010).

SYMBOLIC CAPITAL AND SUSTAINABLE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Researchers also identified that sustainable entrepreneurship is driven by the desire to generate the symbolic capital of their organisation. Symbolic capital was introduced by Pierre Bourdieu, who defined it as "*being known and [recognised] and is more or less synonymous with standing, good name, honour, fame, prestige and reputation"* (mentioned in Gergs, 2003). The benefit of a company's reputation and image is that competitors cannot replicate this, and the company can both attract and retain its customers with it; that is possibly why businesses attach high importance to word of mouth of customers in order to maintain their reputation. It can, therefore, be assumed that entrepreneurs would also be interested in building their symbolic capital through social and environmental activities. This is because Agan et al., (2013) conducted a study on 500 Turkish SMEs, and their results show that soft benefits, such as image, reputation and brand work are significant drivers of the environmental processes of SMEs. Moreover, Ghazilla et al., (2015) conducted a study in Malaysia to identify the barriers to and drivers of green manufacturing practices. They have also identified that an improved company image works as a critical driver of green manufacturing practices. This is because environmental entrepreneurs are interested in establishing their public image through environmental activities that can later be transformed to economic benefits through entrepreneurial activities. It is important, therefore, for entrepreneurs to maintain the reputation of their businesses, which will likely increase the confidence of the customers that give the company the opportunity to generate high profits at a premium price. It is difficult for an organisation to survive in a competitive business environment owing to new businesses, new products or processes and, therefore, gaining a competitive advantage is the ultimate priority of organisations. In this case, the reputation of a business can help to build its competitive advantage (Bronn and Bronn, 2015) and, thus, sustainable enterprises would wish to increase their reputation through social and environmental activities. Iddrisu (2017) conducted exploratory research in the higher education sector in Ghana and their results revealed that reputation works as a tool for achieving a competitive advantage. This is why organisations are striving to maintain a good reputation; it provides an opportunity to improve performance because of the market's trust in the company (Keh and Xie, 2009). This literature, however, only discusses how reputation can increase competitive advantage, which can only be applicable to existing organisations wanting to engage in sustainable activities, providing opportunities for discovering new ventures and their gaining a competitive edge through reputation.

CONCLUSION

This paper looked at the contextual factors including family business background, education, government policies and procedures, financial and non-financial support, market orientation and symbolic capital that can influence entrepreneurs in undertaking sustainable entrepreneurship. This integrated literature review has been conducted based on the literature search on google scholar, therefore, may not have been able to include other current and relevant literature. However, only peer reviewed journal articles have been selected carefully to ensure quality of this paper. Further research can be conducted applying these factors in different entrepreneur groups. In addition, this paper can also assist policymakers in developing policies to facilitate sustainable entrepreneurial activities among entrepreneurs in society.

REFERENCES

Agan, Y. Mechmet, F. A. & Borodin, A. (2013). Drivers of Environmental Process and Their Impact on Performance: A Study of Turkish SMEs. Journal of Cleaner Production, 51, 23-33.

Arogundade, B. B. (2011). Entrepreneurship Education: An Imperative for Sustainable Development in Nigeria. Journal of Emerging Trends in Education Research and Policy Studies, 2(1), 26-29.

Astrachan, J. H., Klein, S. & Smyrnios, K. (2002). The F-PEC Scale of Family Influence: A Proposal for Solving the Family Business Definition Problem. In: Family Business Review, 15 (1), 45–57.

Audretsch, D. B., Heger, D. & Veith, T. (2015). Infrastructure and Entrepreneurship. Small Business Economics, 44(2), 219-230.

Bronn. C. & Bronn, S. P. (2015). A Systems Approach to Understanding How Reputation Contributes to Competitive Advantage. Corporate Reputation Review, 18(2), 69-86.

Cohen, B., & Winn, M. I. (2007). Market Imperfections, Opportunity and Sustainable Entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Venture, 22(1), 29-49.

Cohen, S. (2013). What Do Accelerators Do? Insights from Incubators and Angels, Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization, 8(3-4), 19-25.

Czernich, N., Falck, O., Kretschmer, T. & Woessmann, L. (2011). Broadband Infrastructure and Economic Growth. The Economic Journal, 121(552), 505-532.

Dean, T. J. & McMullen, J. S. (2007). Toward a Theory of Sustainable Entrepreneurship: Reducing Environmental Degradation through Entrepreneurial Action. Journal of Business Venturing, 27(1), 50–76.

Dorado, S. (2006). Social Entrepreneurial Ventures: Different Values so Different Process of Creation, No? Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, 11(4), 319–343.

Dyer, W. G. & Handler, W. (1994). Entrepreneurship and Family Business: Exploring the Connections. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,19(1), 71-83.

Fayolle, A. & Gailly, B. (2013). The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education on Entrepreneurial Attitudes and Intention: Hysteresis and Persistence. Journal of Small Business Management, 53(1), 75-93.

Fogel, S. D. & Gnyawali, R. D. (1994). Environments for Entrepreneurship Development: Key Dimensions and Research Implications. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 18(4), 43-62.

Foltz, J. D. (2004). Credit Market Access and Profitability in Tunisian Agriculture. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 30(3), 229-240.

Friedman, B. A. (2011). The Relationship Between Governance Effectiveness and Entrepreneurship. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1(17), 221-225.

Gandhi, N. S., Thanki, S. J., & Thakkar, J. J. (2018). Ranking of Drivers for Integrated Lean-green Manufacturing for Indian Manufacturing SMEs. Journal of Cleaner Production, 171, 675-689.

Gergs, H. J. (2003). Economic, Social, and Symbolic Capital. International Studies of Management and Organisation, 33(2), 22-48.

Ghazilla, R. A. R., Sakundarini, N., Abdul-Rashid, S. H., Ayub, N. S., Olugu, E. U., & Musa, S. N. (2015) Drivers and Barriers Analysis for Green Manufacturing Practices in Malaysian SMEs: A Preliminary Findings. Procedia CIRP, 26, 658-663.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practice. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 4(1), 75-91.

Gibbs, D. & O'Neill, K. (2012). Green Entrepreneurship: Building a Green Economy? – Evidence from the UK, In Underwood, S., Blundel, R., Lyon, F. and Schaefer, A. (eds.) Social and Sustainable Enterprise: Changing the Nature of Business (Contemporary Issues in Entrepreneurship Research, Vol. 2) Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 75-96.

Goksel, A. and Aydintan, B. (2011). Gender, Business Education, Family Background and Personal Traits; A Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Their Effects on Entrepreneurial Propensity: Findings from Turkey. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2(13), 35-48.

Gunawan, A. & Dhewanto, W. (2012). Why Eco-friendly Family Business is Less Popular in Indonesia? Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 57, 61–68.

Hattab, H. W. (2014). Impact of Entrepreneurship Education on Entrepreneurial Intention of University Students in Egypt. The Journal of Entrepreneurship, 23(1), 1-18.

Hernandez, V. G. J. (2010). The Role of Government in Enhancing Entrepreneurship of Small and Medium Enterprises for Economic Growth. Micro and Small Business Review, 4(3), 40-52.

Hisrich, R. D., Peters, M. P. & Shepherd. D. A. (2008). Entrepreneurship (7th Edition) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41(1), 105-130.

Hockerts, K., & Wustenhagen, R. (2010). Greening Goliaths Versus Emerging Davids-Theorizing about the Role of Incumbents and New Entrants in Sustainable Entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Venturing, 25(5), 481-492.

Huang, Y., Ding, H. & Kao, M. (2009). Salient Stakeholder Voice: Family Business and Green Innovation Adoption. Journal of Management and Organization, 15(3), 309-326.

Iddrisu, M., Andrews, A. & Akolaa, A. (2017). Towards a Strong Corporate Reputation: The Mediating Effect of Identity and Image in Managing Higher Education in Ghana. International Journal of Advanced Educational Research, 2(5), 74-82.

Ihugba, O. A., Odii, A., & Njoku, A. (2014). Theoretical Analysis of Entrepreneurship Challenges and Prospects in Nigeria. International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences, 5, 21-34.

Jansson, J., Nilsson, J., Modig, F., & Hed Vall, G. (2017). Commitment to Sustainability in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: The Influence of Strategic Orientations and Management Values. Business Strategy and the Environment, 26(1) 69-83.

Katz, J. A. (1992). Secondary Analysis in Entrepreneurship: An Introduction to Data Bases and Data Management. Journal of Small Business Management, 30(20), 74-86.

Keat, Y. O., Selvarajah, C. & Meyer, D. (2011). Inclination towards Entrepreneurship among University Students: An Empirical Study of Malaysian University Students. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2(4) 206-220.

Keh, H. T. and Xie, Y. (2009). Corporate Reputation and Customer Behavioral Intentions: The Roles of Trust, Identification and Commitment. Industrial Marketing Management, 38(7), 732-742.

Kim, P., Aldrich, H. & Keister, L. (2006). Access (Not) Denied: The Impact of Financial, Human, and Cultural Capital on Entrepreneurial Entry in the United States. Small Business Economics, 27(1) 5-22.

Kohli, A. K, & Jaworski, B. J. (1990). Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions and Managerial Implications. Journal of Marketing, 54, 1-18.

Kuckertz, A., & Wagner, M. (2010). The Influence of Sustainability Orientation on Entrepreneurial Intentions - Investigating the Role of Business Experience. Journal of Business Venturing, 25(5), 524-539.

Kuttim, M., Kallaste, M., Venesaar, U. & Kiis, A. (2013). Entrepreneurship Education at University Level and Student's Entrepreneurial Intention. Procedia- Social and Behavioural Science, 110, 658-668.

Leahy, G., & Villeneuve-Smith, F. (2009). State of Social Enterprise Survey. London: Social Enterprise Coalition.

Lourenco, F., Jones, O. & Jayawarna, D. (2012). Promoting Sustainable Development: The Role of Entrepreneurship Education. International Small Business Journal, 31(8), 841-865.

Lovell, H. & Smith, S. (2010). Agencement in Housing Markets: The Case of the UK Construction Industry. Geoforum, 41(3), 457-468.

Mahmood, N., Jianfeng, C., Munir, H., Yanran, M. and Car, Y. (2016). Incubators, SMEs and Economic Development of China. International Journal of Multimedia and Ubiquitous Engineering, 11(1), 311-318.

Mason, C. and Brown, R. (2011). Creating Good Public Policy to Support High-growth Firms. Small Business Economics, 40(2), 211-225.

Minniti, M. (2005). Entrepreneurship and Network Externalities. Journal of Behaviour and Organization, 57(1), 1-27.

Mitchell, R. W., Wooliscroft, B., & Higham, J. (2010). Sustainable Market Orientation: A New Approach to Managing Marketing Strategy. Journal of Macro-marketing, 30(2), 160-170.

Monkman, D. (2010). Business Incubators and Their Role in Job Creation. President and CEO National Business Incubation Association (NBIA), Athens, Ohio.

Narver, J., & Slater, S. (1990). The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability. Journal of Marketing, 54(4), 20-35.

Osano, M. H. & Languitone, H. (2016). Factors Influencing Access to Finance by SMEs in Mozambique: Case of SMEs in Maputo Central Business District. Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 5(13), 1-16.

Partanen, J., Chetty, S. & Rajala, A. (2011). Innovation Types and Network Relationships. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 38(5), 1027–55.

Paulson, A. L. & Townsend, R. M. (2005). Financial Constraints and Entrepreneurship: Evidence from the Thai Financial Crisis, Federal Bank of Chicago Economic Perspectives, 29(3) 34-48.

Petrova, K. (2010). Part-Time Entrepreneurship and Financial Constraints: Evidence from the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics. Small Business Economics, 39(2), 473-493.

Saez-Martinez, F. J., Diaz-Garcia, C. & Gonzalez-Moreno, A. (2016). Factors Promoting Environmental Responsibility in European SMEs: The Effect on Performance. Sustainability, 8(9), 1-14.

Safari, Z., Nandr, S. & Ghasemi, Z. (2014). Examining the Role of Education in Reducing Environmental Pollution. Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Science, 4(1), 1178-1183.

Sarkar, R. & Goutam, S. (2015). Green Entrepreneurship in Business Schools: Determining the Green Culture In Education. International Journal of Science, Technology and Management, 4(1), 732-740.

Severo, E. A., Guimaraes, J. C. F., Dellarmelin, M. L., & Ribeiro, R. P. (2019). The Influence of Social Networks on Environmental Awareness and the Social Responsibility of Generations, Brazilian Business Review, 16(5), 500-518.

Shinnar, S. R., Hsu, K. D. & Powell, C. B. (2014). Self-Efficacy, Entrepreneurial Intention, and Gender: Assessing the Impact of Entrepreneurship Education Longitudinally. The International Journal of Management Education, 12(3), 561-570.

Sine, W. & David, R. (2010) Institutions and Entrepreneurship. Research in the Sociology of Work, 21, 1-26.

Tende, S. B. A. (2014). Government Initiatives Toward Entrepreneurship Development in Nigeria. Global Journal of Business Research, 8(1), 109-120.

Ullah, H., Shah, B., Hassan, F. S., & Zaman, T. (2011). The Impact of Owner Psychological Factors on Entrepreneurial Orientation: Evidence from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan, International Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 1(1), 44-59.

Vargas-Hernandez, J. & Noruzi, M. R. (2009) A Study on Entrepreneurship and Role of Government in Enhancing Entrepreneurship by Establishing SMEs and Start-Ups, Timisoara Journal of Economics, 2, 151-158.

Wood, R. & Bandura, A. (1989). Social Cognitive Theory of Organizational Management, Academy of Management Review, 14(3), 361-384.

Woodfield, P., Woods, C. & Shepherd, D. (2017). Sustainable Entrepreneurship: Another Avenue for Family Business Scholarship? Journal of Family Business Management, 7(1), 122-132.

Wu, S. & Wu, L. (2008). The Impact of Higher Education on Entrepreneurial Intentions of University Students in China. Journal of Small and Enterprise Development, 15(4), 752-774.

Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges. Journal of Business Venturing, 24(5), 519–532.