



Economía solidaria y economía comunitaria: enfoques que dinamizan las nuevas ruralidades

Dustin Gómez | [iD](#) Uniagustiniana y Uniasturias (Colombia)
Ehyder Barbosa | [iD](#) Uniagustiniana y Uniasturias (Colombia)

RESUMEN El objetivo del artículo es identificar y difundir distintos emprendimientos y organizaciones que representan un diálogo entre la economía solidaria y la economía comunitaria, enfoques que contribuyen al fortalecimiento y desarrollo de las nuevas ruralidades en el Estado colombiano. La metodología empleada es de corte cualitativo mediante el método de revisión documental, complementado con ecuaciones de búsqueda desde la bibliometría. La conclusión principal es que a medida que la economía comunitaria y la economía solidaria avanzan hacia el futuro, estas direcciones y áreas de investigación emergentes ofrecen perspectivas valiosas para la expansión y mejora del campo. La sostenibilidad ambiental, las tecnologías emergentes, el desarrollo rural, la justicia social y la resiliencia comunitaria son dimensiones críticas que requieren una atención más profunda. Al abordar estos temas, los investigadores pueden contribuir significativamente a la construcción de modelos económicos más justos, sostenibles e inclusivos.

PALABRAS CLAVE Comunidad, cooperación económica, economía rural, economía en transición.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN 8/1/2024 FECHA DE REVISIÓN 18/04/2024 FECHA DE APROBACIÓN 25/04/2024

Solidarity economy and community economy Approaches that energize the new ruralities

ABSTRACT The objective of the article is to identify and disseminate different enterprises and organizations that represent a dialogue between solidarity economy and community economy, approaches that contribute to the strengthening and development of the new ruralities in the Colombian State. The methodology used is qualitative through the documentary review method, complemented with bibliometric search equations. The main conclusion is that as the community economy and solidarity economy move into the future, these emerging directions and areas of research offer valuable perspectives for the expansion and improvement of the field. Environmental sustainability, emerging technologies, rural development, social justice, and community resilience are critical dimensions that require deeper attention. By addressing these issues, researchers can contribute significantly to building more just, sustainable, and inclusive economic models.

KEY WORDS Community, economic cooperation, rural economy, economy in transition.

JEL CODES A13, P13, R11.

INTRODUCTION

The literature on Community Economics and Solidarity Economics has experienced significant growth in recent decades, reflecting a growing interest in more sustainable, inclusive, and community-centered economic models. However, these bodies of knowledge also reveal a series of conceptual and practical challenges that Community and Solidarity Economics face, generating debates and controversies within academia (Laville and Gaiger, 2013; Laverack, 2001).

Similarly, community-centered and solidarity-focused development approaches are based on the premise that local communities and stakeholders should play a central role in their own development. This theory emphasizes the active participation of the community, social actors, and economic agents in identifying their needs, decision-making processes, and the implementation of development strategies. In the context of Community Economics and Solidarity Economics, these approaches underscore the importance of empowering communities, economic agents, and social actors to define their own economic and social goals (Defourny and Nyssens, 2017; Laverack, 2001; Chambers, 1997).

Therefore, this review article aims to identify and share different initiatives and organizations that reflect a dialogue between Solidarity Economics and Community Economics as approaches that contribute to strengthening and developing New Ruralities in Colombia. To achieve this, the article is structured with an introduction as already presented, followed by the description of analytical categories within the theoretical framework, then detailing the methodology, presenting the results, engaging in a discussion, drawing conclusions, and finally, providing the bibliography used in the research exercise.

PROBLEM

The practices and characteristics of the enterprises and organizations that integrate the solidarity economy and the community economy in Colombia play an important role in the promotion and development of new ruralities. These economic models, based on principles of solidarity, cooperation and mutualism, not only promote local economic development, but also strengthen the social and cultural fabric of rural communities, thus contributing to their sustainability and resilience (Serntedakis, 2017; Dougé, 2019).

The solidarity economy prioritizes the needs of the community over the maximization of individual profit, thus facilitating the development of more inclusive and equitable enterprises. This translates into greater community participation in decision-making and resource management, which in turn fosters a strong sense of ownership and collective responsibility. These enterprises not only generate employment, but also reinvest their profits back into the community, thus improving local infrastructure and basic services essential for rural development (Kawano, 2020; Lee, 2020).

On the other hand, the community economy promotes sustainable and environmentally friendly practices, which are vital in the context of the new ruralities, where the relationship with the land and natural resources represents crucial aspects in their

development. These practices not only help to preserve ecosystems, but also ensure the sustainability of the agricultural and artisanal activities on which rural communities depend for their livelihoods (Vidal, 2022; Schlegel, 2022; Matarrita et al., 2022).

It is therefore crucial that the Colombian state, economic associations and civil society in general invest more in supporting and promoting the solidarity and community economy as key strategies for the development of the new ruralities. This could include the implementation of policies that facilitate access to finance for solidarity and community enterprises, the creation of support networks that connect these enterprises to wider markets, and the promotion of education and training in solidarity and community economy principles and practices (Ferguson, 2018; Wright, 2021).

It is therefore important to study the characteristics and practices of the solidarity and community economy and the potential it has, not only to transform the rural economy in Colombia, but also to strengthen the social and cultural bases that sustain these communities, thus facilitating a development that is both economic and human, and that contributes to the construction of a fairer society (Cid and Arias, 2019; Sak, 2021).

QUESTION

How do the characteristics and practices of enterprises and organizations that integrate the solidarity economy and the community economy in Colombia contribute to the strengthening and development of the new ruralities in the Colombian state?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

COMMUNITY ECONOMICS

One of the most evident challenges in the literature on Community Economics is the lack of a universally accepted definition and clear conceptual boundaries. The diversity of approaches, ranging from Solidarity Economics to cooperatives and local development projects, has led to debates about which practices and structures should be considered part of Community Economics. Some scholars argue that this lack of precision hinders the comparison and evaluation of initiatives, while others contend that conceptual flexibility is a strength reflecting the diversity of contexts and approaches (Amin and Thrift, 2017; Gibson, 2006).

From a historical perspective, the Industrial Revolution marked a turning point in the evolution of Community Economics. The emergence of large-scale production and urbanization led to a separation between labor and community. As factories and cities grew, traditional community relationships were threatened. However, by the late 19th and early 20th centuries, cooperative movements began to emerge in response to the challenges of industrialization. Cooperatives, such as the Rochdale in 1844, sought to provide workers with an alternative to unfair working conditions and capitalist

exploitation. These early cooperative efforts laid the foundation for modern community economic initiatives (Rendón and Gómez, 2020; Moulaert and Ailenei, 2005).

During the 20th century, economic crises and world wars increased awareness of the need for alternative economic solutions. In this context, movements like Mondragón in Spain, which established a successful industrial cooperative, demonstrated that collective ownership and participatory management were economically viable. The rise of social movements in the 1960s and 1970s also influenced community economics. Advocates for sustainable development and social justice advocated for more inclusive and community-centered economic models (Maldonado, 2018, 2017; Gómez, 2021). During this period, numerous cooperatives and Community Economics projects emerged worldwide, from Banco Palmas in Brazil to Ecological Communities in the United States (Gómez, 2020; Thompson, 1966; Polanyi, 1944).

In recent decades, globalization and technology have posed new challenges and opportunities for community economics. On one hand, global interconnectedness allows the exchange of ideas and resources between communities. On the other hand, market forces often threaten local community structures. Consequently, the historical evolution of Community Economics reflects a constant search for alternatives to dominant economic models. From its roots in pre-industrial practices to its development in cooperative movements and modern projects, community economics has proven to be resilient and adaptable over time (Rincón and Gómez, 2023; Laville and Cattani, 2009; Whyte and Whyte, 1991).

SOLIDARITY ECONOMY

Solidarity Economy advocates for forms of economic organization based on solidarity, cooperation, and reciprocity. In this approach, businesses and organizations seek to maximize not only individual benefit but also collective benefit and social and environmental sustainability. In the context of Community Economics, Solidarity Economy emphasizes the importance of building economic relationships that strengthen collectivity and reduce inequality (Gómez, Laverde, and Barbosa, 2021; Laville and Gaiger, 2013; Moulaert and Ailenei, 2005; Defourny and Nyssens, 2017).

Precisely, Solidarity Economy seeks to address 21st-century issues through its dimensions. To achieve this, it identifies altruistic flows and mutual flows. The former occurs when a group of people comes together to address an issue in their environment, aiming to help others without necessarily seeking individual benefits beyond collaboration (Volunteering). The latter refers to a situation where a group of people collaborates to address an issue with common benefits (cooperatives, employee funds, pre-cooperatives, etc.) (Álvarez, 2017, 2011; Arango, 2005).

NEW RURALITIES

«New Ruralities» emerges as a developing conceptualization that enriches the perspective on rural areas. It presents a more comprehensive approach to addressing the current situation of the country, especially in relation to the Havana Agreements. It contemplates the possibility of utilizing territories and their various territorialities

to reconfigure agro-export chains, with the potential to improve the quality of life for inhabitants and overcome the hegemonic dichotomy associating rural areas with backwardness and urban areas with modernity (Gómez, 2023; Rendón and Gómez, 2022).

This renewed conceptualization is based on the intricate relationship and multivariate connections between the rural and urban, essential for understanding present phenomena. Interpretations and conceptions of rural development evolve as the diversity and complexity of reality become more transparent, enriching discourse and actions in rural communities. This underscores that structural changes, from the perspective of globalization and territorial differences, significantly impact this approach (DNP, 2021; Laverde et al., 2020; Díaz et al., 2020).

Consequently, it is highlighted that «the rural» goes beyond agriculture, maintaining strong links of exchange with the urban. This exchange extends beyond the provision of food, encompassing a wide range of goods and services, such as the provision and care of natural resources, spaces for relaxation, and contributions to the maintenance and development of culture (Farah and Pérez, 2003; Forero, 2002).

It is recognized that various activities in the rural domain, whether economic, social, or related to the management of natural resources, as well as the different roles of the inhabitants, require additional categories and concepts for analysis. Therefore, the field now integrates various activities such as agroforestry, mining, agro-industrial processes, fishing, livestock farming, a variety of productive units, crafts, tourism, among others (Pérez and Farh, 2006; Pérez, 2004). This holistic approach allows for a more detailed and nuanced understanding of new ruralities and their contemporary dynamics (Rodríguez, Laverde and Pérez, 2021; Rendón, 2017a, 2017b).

METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed follows a qualitative approach, utilizing document review through matrices in Excel sheets to systematize divergences and convergences among authors. The matrix comprises columns of information that identify the general objective of the selected writing to comprehend the argumentative line. It includes a column titled «methodology» to identify the approach and scope, another column reflecting the results to understand the findings, and the author's literal conclusions column to comprehend its abstraction. Finally, a synthesis of the writing is conducted, providing the foundation for the current paper (Rincón and Gómez 2023; Castro et al., 2017; Gómez, Carranza and Ramos, 2016; Carrizo, 2000; Rushforth, 2016).

Additionally, to conduct the document review, searches were complemented with equations (Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3) for the analytical categories from the theoretical framework: Solidarity Economy, Community Economics, and New Ruralities. The observation window spanned 20 years, and searches were conducted on internationally and nationally recognized databases such as Web of Science (WOS), Scopus, Dialnet, and Redalyc. The consulted documents specifically refer to the case of Colombia (Aguilera et al., 2020; Barbosa Vargas and Gómez, 2020; Basten and Haamann, 2018; Ruiz, 1996).

The use of matrices for presenting bibliographic information is justified due to their efficiency in organizing extensive data from diverse sources in a structured

manner. These matrices provide researchers with a systematic tool to synthesize and compare findings, identify patterns, and establish connections between different academic works (Pan, 2013). Specialized research has demonstrated that matrices in literature reviews facilitate a deep understanding of existing literature, promote the identification of gaps and trends in knowledge (Boswell et al., 2007), and offer a solid foundation for academic writing by providing a clear overview of diverse perspectives in a specific field (Ridley, 2008; Weingart, 2005).

The initial search resulted in 326 records obtained from databases. During the first selection phase, titles and abstracts were assessed for relevance, relatedness to the proposed categories, and all duplicate entries were eliminated. This phase culminated in the selection of 255 publications, the full texts of which were subsequently reviewed. In this second phase, we discarded those publications that used the terms «solidarity» and «community» merely as idioms. Specifically, we excluded papers that mentioned these terms superficially, often only in keywords or abstracts, without devoting significant analysis to the concept (Vidal et al., 2024).

The second round of screening provided us with a final sample of 97 publications. It should be noted that by restricting our search exclusively to publications that explicitly mention «solidarity economy» and «community economy», we inevitably excluded a broad spectrum of studies that could have addressed relevant issues related to these categories (Todeschini, 2016; Al Jamini et al., 2022).

The review process combined deductive and inductive coding techniques. Initially, we applied predefined bibliometric equations to broadly characterize the publications, which are described in detail in Annex 1. Subsequently, we coded the publications according to the various ways of interpreting and applying solidarity or community-based approaches. We also analyzed trends in the objectives of the publications over time to understand the development and evolution of the conceptualizations of the approaches examined (Tijssen and Winnink, 2016; Ahmad et al., 2020).

RESULTS

Measuring the success and impact of Community Economics and Solidarity Economics initiatives is a crucial challenge. The literature emphasizes the need to move beyond purely economic metrics to include social and environmental dimensions. However, the lack of standardized frameworks and the difficulty in quantifying intangible aspects such as community strengthening raise questions about the real effectiveness of these initiatives (Gómez, Aldana and Rodríguez, 2021; North, 2013; Brousselle and Champagne, 2011). The following are descriptions of some experiences in Colombia that reflect how Community and Solidarity Economics are approaches contributing to the revitalization of social fabric and the productive apparatus, also aligning with the New Ruralities in the Colombian countryside (see Table 1).

The identification of the aforementioned associations also had efficiency as a guiding principle. Indeed, efficiency in Community Economics is measured differently from traditional efficiency. Instead of simply maximizing production and minimizing costs, it focuses on satisfying local needs and promoting long-term economic resilience. It seeks to avoid the exploitation of resources in the short term and favors

Table 1. Experiences of Community Economics and Solidarity Economics in Colombia

ASSOCIATIONS	TERRITORY	OBSERVATIONS	SOURCE
Desarrollo de la Economía Solidaria en Barranquilla	Barranquilla, Atlántico, Colombia	Barranquilla, on Colombia's Caribbean coast, has experienced significant growth in solidarity economy initiatives. The Mario Santo Domingo Foundation has led projects that integrate communities in urban development, ensuring the active participation of residents in the planning and management of their neighborhoods.	(Socarrás y Cantillo, 2019)
Asociación de Emprendedores Culturales del Turismo de Aracataca con el NIT 901740179-2. Inscrita el 3 de agosto del 2023	Aracataca Magdalena, Colombia	In the territory of Aracataca Magdalena Colombia, in 2023 the association was made official, which was derived from one of the research projects of one of the authors of this writing, which aims to «Dinamizar procesos sociales, culturales, artesanales artísticos, pedagógicos, emprendimientos culturales y el desarrollo integral de las comunidades sociales deprimidas y vulnerables en el municipio de Aracataca, en el departamento del Magdalena y del país. Con énfasis en la atención de la población. en general adelantado actividades para el desarrollo humano integral, asistencia social, orientación psicosocial, formación de líderes y fortalecimiento de la familia como núcleo de la sociedad, así como la defensa y proyección de expresiones culturales tradicionales de nuestras regiones colombianas» (CCS, 2022, p. 3). A clear example of empowerment of the endogenous factors of the territory and its territoriality that develops and strengthens community relations from the solidarity economy and specifically from short marketing circuits	(Uniagustinia, 2023; Garzón et al., 2022)
Microfinanzas comunitarias en Cali	Cali, Valle del Cauca, Colombia	En Cali, las microfinanzas comunitarias han surgido como una estrategia para empoderar a emprendedores locales. La Fundación WWB Colombia ha implementado programas que ofrecen acceso a servicios financieros a mujeres emprendedoras, fomentando la autonomía económica y el desarrollo local.	(Peña y Rodríguez, 2018)

Iniciativas de economía solidaria en Medellín	Medellín, Antioquia, Colombia	Medellín, Colombia's second largest city, has been a pioneer in the implementation of solidarity economy initiatives that seek to address socioeconomic challenges. A notable example is the Comprehensive Work Cooperative, Coointral, which operates in the service sector and promotes self-management of its workers. Coointral has shown that the solidarity economy can contribute to the generation of sustainable employment and the improvement of working conditions.	(Restrepo y Álvarez, 2019)
Las comunidades indígenas y la economía comunitaria	Riohacha, Guajira, Colombia	En las regiones con presencia de comunidades indígenas, la economía comunitaria ha sido esencial para preservar las prácticas culturales y fortalecer la autonomía económica. La iniciativa de la Asociación de Mujeres Indígenas Wayúu, en La Guajira, destaca la producción y comercialización de artesanías tradicionales como una fuente de ingresos que respeta y valora la cultura indígena.	(Loperena, 2016)
Cooperativas de agricultores en Tolima	Gaitana, Tolima, Colombia	The community economy in rural areas of Colombia has focused on promoting sustainable agriculture through cooperatives. The Gaitania Coffee Growers Cooperative, Tolima, has been a success story in promoting environmentally friendly agricultural practices and guaranteeing fair prices for farmers. This model highlights how cooperation can improve the quality of life of rural communities.	(Jiménez y Vargas, 2020)
Emprendimientos comunitarios en Bogotá	Bogotá, Cundinamarca, Colombia	In the capital, Bogotá, community ventures have emerged that seek to address urban problems and strengthen social cohesion. The «Recycling Dreams» initiative is an example, where grassroots recyclers have formed a cooperative to sustainably manage waste, generating income and improving working conditions.	(Bedoya y Zambrano, 2020).
Cooperativa COOMEPE	Caldono, Cauca, Colombia.	The COOMEPE cooperative was formed thanks to the commitments of the Peace Agreement between the Government of Colombia and the FARC EP. It is a project endorsed by the UN as having a rapid impact and represents the largest solidarity economy organization for reincorporated people in Colombia. Its productive projects include HASS avocado, cape gooseberry, trout, pigs and housing construction.	(Barbosa et al., 2021; Barbosa, 2023a, 2023b)

<p>Asociación de Avicultores y Productores Agropecuarios y de Turismo (ASOAVIPROAGRO). Asociación Unión de Migrantes de la Amazonia Colombiana (UMACO). Cooperativa Multiactiva Recuperando Herencia Campesina (ECOTIENDA MANIFUE). Asociación de emprendedores agropecuarios del medio Caguán (Asoempredeagro del Caguán). Asociación Frutos de la Aguililla (ASOFRUTAL)</p>	<p>Departamento del Caquetá, región de la Amazonia: Colombia</p>	<p>The project called «Food Security and Rural Development in 5 Municipalities of Caquetá (SADER)» was materialized thanks to the inter-institutional collaboration at the territorial level between the National Secretariat of Social Pastoral and the Norwegian Caritas Agency. Indeed, the main purpose of the initiative was to increase the economic income of 400 peasant families in five municipalities of the Department of Caquetá, located in the Amazon Region, within the State of Colombia, during the period 2018-2022. All of this in order to promote the construction of sovereignty and guarantee food security in the area. The associations presented participated in this project.</p>	<p>(Gómez y Aguirre, 2023)</p>
---	--	---	--------------------------------

Fuente: revisión documental con ecuaciones de búsqueda desde la bibliometría.

environmental sustainability. Efficiency is measured in terms of community well-being and quality of life, not solely in monetary terms (Martínez, 2023; 2017).

Efficiency in Solidarity Economics is not measured solely in monetary terms. However, it aims to optimize the allocation of resources to meet the needs of all participants. By fostering collaboration and collective decision-making, the likelihood of waste is reduced, and the value generated by economic activities is maximized. Efficiency, in this context, involves using resources effectively for the benefit of the entire community (Osorio and Rojas, 2023; Pérez, 2014).

DISCUSSION

Community Economics focuses on local and sustainable development, promoting the active participation of the community in economic decision-making. It subscribes to economic structures that reflect the needs and values of local communities, fostering autonomy and self-determination. The priority is to build economic relationships that benefit all community members, reducing inequalities and promoting social justice (Laville, 2016; Díaz, 2011). Similarly, Solidarity Economics focuses on cooperation among different economic actors (Giraldo, 2017). Indeed, it seeks to build economic systems based on solidarity, equity, and collaboration. Instead of competing, businesses and individuals work together to meet their needs and aspirations. Solidarity economics promotes collective ownership, cooperatives, and other forms of

organization that seek to maximize the well-being of all participants (Garzón, Barbosa and Gómez, 2023; De Souza Santos, 2011).

This article aligns with the postulates of (North and Longhurst, 2016; Seyfang and Haxeltine, 2012) when they assert that an emerging and critical direction is the correlation between environmental sustainability and Community Economics and Solidarity Economics. Although the literature has emphasized the importance of considering the environmental impacts of economic activities, there is a growing need to investigate how Community Economics models can contribute to environmental resilience (Alier and Jusmet, 2015; Alier, 2011). Current studies suggest that cooperatives and community businesses can adopt more sustainable practices, but deeper research is required to understand how these practices translate into tangible benefits for the environment (Maldonado, 2021; Téllez et al., 2020).

The results of the research exercise resonate with (Smith and Stirling, 2010; Brondizio et al., 2009) when they emphasize that communities adopting models of Community Economics and Solidarity Economics often show greater economic resilience to external changes. Indeed, they have highlighted that economic diversification driven by Community and Solidarity Economics can help communities better face economic crises and adapt to changes in the business environment (Dávila et al., 2018; Barbosa, Rojas and Gómez, 2021).

With the same purpose, (Chaves, 2008; Borzaga and Tortia, 2006) align with the postulates of the article when they point out that one of the most direct impacts of Community Economics and Solidarity Economics is the generation of local employment and economic empowerment of participants. Research has highlighted that cooperatives and community businesses have the potential to create sustainable employment, especially in areas where job opportunities are limited. A study on cooperatives in Latin America found that these businesses often outperform conventional companies in terms of job stability and fair wages, thus contributing to the economic empowerment of workers (Cueto et al., 2018; Rubio Téllez and Gómez, 2019).

In addition to the above, it is essential to consider how these models can address complex structural challenges, such as:

Resilience to climate change: Economic practices that integrate the solidarity and community economy often incorporate sustainable and environmentally friendly approaches that can help rural communities adapt to the effects of climate change. Organic and sustainable farming methods not only maintain soil health and increase biodiversity, but also reduce dependence on costly and potentially harmful external inputs (Barbosa, Rojas and Gómez, 2021). These methods can be shared and replicated through cooperatives and solidarity economy networks, broadening their impact (Cid and Arias, 2019).

Mitigating rural-urban migration: Lack of viable economic opportunities is a major cause of rural-urban migration. Solidarity and community-based enterprises can offer sustainable economic alternatives that improve economic well-being without individuals having to leave their communities. Agricultural cooperatives that offer better market conditions and technical support to their members can make farming more attractive and profitable for younger generations (Garrido, 2023; OECD, 2023b).

Reducing inequalities: Solidarity and community economies are particularly efficient in reducing inequalities (April, 2023). By focusing on equity and redistribution of resources, they can play a crucial role in alleviating poverty and improving income distribution. In rural communities, where inequalities are often exacerbated by

geographic isolation and lack of access to basic services, the solidarity economy can facilitate the development of community infrastructure, from health systems to education and technology, thereby strengthening social cohesion and equity (Morandeira et al., 2021; OECD, 2023a).

Empowerment of vulnerable populations: Solidarity and community economy practices promote the inclusion and empowerment of vulnerable populations, including women, youth, indigenous people and victims of Colombia's armed conflict. By offering opportunities for economic and political participation on equal terms, these economies foster diversity and inclusion, essential elements for sustainable development (Cid and Arias, 2019; Barbosa, 2023).

CONCLUSIONS

As Community Economics and Solidarity Economics move towards the future, these emerging directions and research areas offer valuable insights for the expansion and improvement of the field. Environmental sustainability, emerging technologies, rural development, social justice, and community resilience are critical dimensions that require deeper attention. By addressing these issues, researchers can significantly contribute to the construction of fairer, more sustainable, and inclusive economic models.

The connection between Social Economics and Community Economics with social justice is an urgent and necessary research field. While the literature recognizes the capacity of Community Economics to address inequalities, there is a lack of specific focus on how these models can contribute to racial justice. Future research should explore how Community Economics and Solidarity Economics initiatives can be designed and managed to systematically address ethnic disparities and promote equity.

The role of emerging technologies in Community Economics and Solidarity Economics is a fascinating area of research. Digital platforms, blockchain, and other technological innovations have the potential to transform how communities engage in economic activities. However, the question arises of how these technologies can be used to strengthen community and solidarity autonomy without replicating the inequalities present in conventional economic models. Future research should explore how technology can be an ally in building community-based and inclusive solidarity economies.

The integration of the solidarity economy with community-based economic practices represents a robust and sustainable strategy for the development of ruralities in Colombia. The complementarity between these economies not only reinforces the capacity of rural economic systems in the face of both global and local challenges, but also strengthens social cohesion and community structures. This synergy is essential for the empowerment and autonomy of rural communities, enabling progress that is sustained from within and tailored to their specific needs. In addition, it is crucial that this integration is accompanied by supportive government policies. These policies should encourage and facilitate the expansion of economic models that promote equitable and inclusive development. Doing so will not only contribute to the economic and social strengthening of rural communities, but also to building a more just and sustainable future for the country.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S., Javed, Y., Hussain Khahro, S. and Shahid, A. (2020). Research contribution of the oldest seat of higher learning in Pakistan: a bibliometric analysis of University of the Punjab. *Publications*, 8(3), 43. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications8030043>
- Alier, J. y Jusmet, J. (2015). *Economía ecológica y política ambiental*. Fondo de Cultura económica.
- Alier, J. (2011). Macroeconomía ecológica, metabolismo social y justicia ambiental. *RHA*, (8), 244-281.
- Al-Jamimi, H., BinMakhashen, G. and Bornmann, L. (2022). Use of bibliometrics for research evaluation in emerging markets economies: a review and discussion of bibliometric indicators. *Scientometrics*, 127(10), 5879-5930. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04490-8>
- Álvarez, J. (2017). Economía social y solidaria en el territorio: significantes y construcción de políticas públicas. *Pontificia Universidad Javeriana*, 1-82.
- Álvarez, J. (2011). A propósito de la dimensión de las organizaciones de economía social y solidaria. Cátedra Felipe Medina. Unidad de Estudios Solidarios de la Pontificia Universidad Javeriana.
- Aguilera, M., Rincón, M. y Gómez, D. (2020). Bioeconomía, una alternativa de investigación en administración y afines. En M. Aguilera-Prado y M. Rincón-Moreno (eds.), *Temas y métodos de investigación en negocios, administración, mercadeo y contaduría* (pp. 193-218). Editorial Uniagustiniana. <https://doi.org/10.28970/9789585498426.06>
- Amin, A. y Thrift, N. (2017). *Seeing like a city*. Polity.
- April, K. (2023). AI-Induced solidarity economy: the need for stewardship orientation. *Effective executive*, 26(3), 30-45. Recuperado de <https://eds-p-ebSCOhost-com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=f1129b97-9927-4d5d-abf2-9c7c0dc4d85b%40redis>
- Arango, J. (2005). *La empresa de economía solidaria. Manual de cooperativismo y economía solidaria* (pp. 199-213). Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia.
- Bambo, T. and Pouris, A. (2020). Bibliometric analysis of bioeconomy research in South Africa. *Scientometrics*, 125(1), 29-51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03626-y>
- Barbosa, E. (2023). Asociatividad solidaria para la construcción de Paz en Colombia: organizaciones de economía solidaria en el departamento del Cauca. Twentieth International Conference on Environmental, Cultural, Economic and Social Sustainability, University of Aveiro.
- Barbosa, E. (2023). Asociatividad solidaria para la construcción de Paz en Colombia. Congreso Internacional Multidisciplinario de Investigadores y Académicos de Iberoamérica. Expanding los límites del conocimiento (REDIPA).
- Barbosa, Gómez y Merchán. (2021). La economía solidaria como dinamizadora del desarrollo rural y de la construcción de la paz en Colombia. *Revista Iberoamericana de Economía Solidaria e Innovación Socioecológica (RIESISE)*.
- Barbosa, E., Rojas, J. y Gómez, D. (2021). Prueba piloto del Plan Nacional de Fomento de la Economía Solidaria y Cooperativa Rural (PLANFES). Estudio del caso del municipio de San Antero, Córdoba, Colombia. *Otra economía: revista latinoamericana de economía social y solidaria*, 14(25), 77-94.
- Barbosa, E., Vargas, H. y Gómez, D. (2020). Breve estudio bibliométricos sobre economía solidaria. *Cooperativismo y Desarrollo*, 28(118), 1-20. <https://revistas.ucc.edu.co/index.php/co/article/view/3723>

- Barbosa, E., Merchán, O. y Gómez, D. (2020). La economía solidaria como potenciador del desarrollo rural y de la construcción de la paz en Colombia. Ponencia. IV Seminario Internacional de Desarrollo y Territorio, Universidad de La Salle, Bogotá, Colombia.
- Basten, D. y Haamann, T. (2018). Approaches for organizational learning: a literature review. *Sage Open*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018794224>
- Bedoya, N. y Zambrano, P. (2020). Empoderamiento femenino a través de la gestión de residuos sólidos en Bogotá. *Cuadernos de Desarrollo Rural*, 17(82).
- Brondizio, E., Ostrom, E. and Young, O. (2009). Connectivity and the governance of multilevel social-ecological systems: the role of social capital. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, (34), 253-278.
- Brousselle, A. and Champagne, F. (2011). Program theory evaluation: Logic analysis. *Evaluation and program planning*, 34(1), 69-78.
- Borzaga, C. and Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(2), 225-248.
- Boswell, C., Cannon, S. and Miller, A. (2007). The potential of quantitative content analysis. *The Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, 128-144.
- Castro, L., Rincón, M. y Gómez, D. (2017). Educación para la salud: una mirada desde la antropología. *Revista Ciencias de la Salud*, 15(1), 145-163. <https://doi.org/10.12804/revistas.urosario.edu.co/revsalud/a.5387>
- Carrizo, G. (2000). Hacia un concepto de bibliometría. *Revista de Investigación Iberoamericana en Ciencia de la Información y Documentación*, 1(2), 1-10.
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts? Putting the first last*. Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Chaves, R. (2008). *Cooperatives and employment: a global report*. International Labour Organization (ILO).
- Cid, B. y Arias, L. (2019). La economía solidaria en la politización del trabajo escondido de las mujeres. *Estudios Feministas*, 27(2), 1-12. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26748033>
- Cueto, E., Arboleda, O., Zabala y Echeverry, F. (2018). Una década de economía social y solidaria en Colombia: análisis de la producción investigativa y académica 2005-2015. Bogotá, Colombia: Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios - UNIMINUTO y Universidad Católica Luis Amigó.
- Dávila, R., Vargas, A., Blanco, L., Roa, E., Cáceres, L. y Vargas, L. (2018). Características de la economía solidaria colombiana. Aproximaciones a las corrientes influyentes en Colombia. CIRIEC España. *Revista de Economía Pública, Social y Cooperativa*, (93), 85-113.
- Defourny, J. and Nyssens, M. (2017). The EMES Approach of social enterprise in a comparative perspective. In *Social enterprise: at the crossroads of market, public policies and civil society* (pp. 3-26). Routledge.
- De Souza Santos, B. (2011). *Producir para vivir. Los caminos de la producción no capitalista*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Díaz, M., Quintanilla, D. y Sandoval, J. (2020). La economía solidaria en Colombia: una revisión conceptual, económica y normativa. *Revista FACCEA*, 10(1), 62-79.
- Díaz, J. (2011). *Las economías solidarias latinoamericanas como construcción de alternativas de resistencia y liberación desde abajo: un estudio comparado de casos micro y*

- macro de México, Argentina, Brasil y Bolivia (1989-2009)* (tesis de doctorado). Iteso. Guadalajara. <http://rei.iteso.mx/handle/11117/1092>
- Dougé, M. (2019). Solidarity economy praxis in limonade: reintellecting woman as subject. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 47(3/4), 190-211. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26803274>
- DNP. (2021). Departamento Nacional de Planeación. Colombia tiene nueva política pública para el desarrollo de la economía solidaria. DNP.
- Farah, M. y Pérez, E. (2003). Mujeres rurales y nueva ruralidad en Colombia. Cuadernos de Desarrollo Rural, N.º 51. Instituto de Estudios Rurales. Facultad de Estudios Ambientales y Rurales, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Segundo semestre 2003, Bogotá.
- Ferguson, G. (2018). The social economy in Bolivia: indigeneity, solidarity, and alternatives to capitalism. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 29(6), 1233-1243. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45105594>
- Forero, J. (2002). La economía campesina colombiana, 1990-2001. *Cuadernos Tierra y Justicia*, N.º 2, agosto. Bogotá.
- Gibson-Graham, J. (2006). *A postcapitalist politics*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Garzón, B., Barbosa, E. y Gómez, D. (2023). Las organizaciones comunales como gestoras de reactivación económica: mercados campesinos solidarios en el municipio el Playón, Santander. *CIRIEC Colombia*, 1(1), 245-253.
- Garrido, N. (2023). Gendered networks and work. The case of social entrepreneurship, and the social and solidarity economy in Barcelona. <http://hdl.handle.net/10803/688754>
- Giraldo, C. (coord.) (2017). *Economía popular desde abajo*. Ediciones desde abajo.
- Garzón, B., Barbosa, E. y Gómez, D. (2022). Política pública en la pandemia desde la economía solidaria: circuitos cortos de comercialización (CCC) en Colombia (2020-2021). *Apuntes de Economía y Sociedad*, 3(1), 25-36. <https://doi.org/10.5377/aes.v3i1.14287>
- Gómez, D. y Aguirre, M. (2023). Seguridad alimentaria y desarrollo rural en 5 municipios del departamento del Caquetá, Colombia. Periodo 2018-2022. *Población y Desarrollo*, 29(57), 75-93. <https://doi.org/10.18004/pdfce/2076-054x/2023.029.57.075>
- Gómez, D. (2022). *Metabolismo social de la agroindustria de la palma de aceite en el territorio de Aracataca Magdalena Colombia (1965-2018)* (tesis de doctorado en Agrociencias). Facultad de Ciencias Agropecuarias. Obtenido de https://ciencia.lasalle.edu.co/doct_agrociencias/14
- Gómez, D., Aldana, K. y Rodríguez, R. (2021). Antropologías del desarrollo, enfoques alternativos y posdesarrollo. Breve revisión de conceptos y apuntes críticos. *Población y Desarrollo*, 27(52), 108-122.
- Gómez, D. (2021). Sostenibilidad. *Inclusión y Desarrollo*, 8(1), 131-143. <https://doi.org/10.26620/uniminuto.inclusion.8.1.2021.131-143>
- Gómez, D. (2020). Metabolismo social y bioética. Un diálogo de saberes. *Revista Iberoamericana de Bioética*, (12), 01-11.
- Gómez, D., Laverde, M. and Barbosa, E. (2021). Short commercialization circuits in local supply chains: economic revival in the pandemic. *South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics*, 12(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.9>
- Gómez, D., Carranza, Y. y Ramos, C. (2016). Revisión documental, una herramienta para el mejoramiento de las competencias de lectura y escritura en estudiantes

- universitarios. *Chakiñan, Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades*, (1), 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.37135/chk.002.01.04>
- Kawano, E. (2020). Solidarity economy: building an economy for people and planet. In *The new systems reader* (pp. 285-302). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367313401>
- Laverack, G. (2001). An identification and interpretation of the organizational aspects of community empowerment. *Community Development Journal*, 36(2), 134-145.
- Laverde, M., Almanza, C., Gómez D. y Serrano, R. (2020). El capital relacional como recurso diferencial y valioso para las empresas. *PÓDIUM*, (37), 57-70. <https://doi.org/10.31095/podium.2020.37.5>
- Laville, J. (2016). *Economía social y solidaria frente a las políticas públicas: conceptos, prácticas y políticas públicas*. Biblioteca del Campus de Álava.
- Laville, J. and Cattani, A. (2009). The social and solidarity economy: a theoretical and plural framework. *Revue internationale de l'économie sociale*, (317), 5-26.
- Laville, J. and Gaiger, L. (2013). *Solidarity economy: key concepts and issues*. RIPSS.
- Lee, S. (2020). Role of social and solidarity economy in localizing the sustainable development goals. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 27(1), 65-71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2019.1670274>
- Loperena, C. (2016). Empresas indígenas en Colombia: un análisis desde la teoría económica feminista. *Revista CEA*, (21), 59-88.
- Jiménez, J. y Vargas, J. (2020). Desarrollo territorial y cadena de valor de café orgánico en la vereda Gaitania, Tolima, Colombia. *Cuadernos de Desarrollo Rural*, 17(81).
- Maldonado, C. (2021). Las organizaciones inteligentes son organizaciones que saben de complejidad. *Revista Ciencias de la Complejidad*, 2(1), 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.48168/cc012021-008>
- Maldonado, C. (2018). Bioeconomía, biodesarrollo y civilización. Un mapa de problemas y soluciones. En *Epistemologías del Sur para germinar alternativas de desarrollo. Debate entre Enrique Leff, Carlos Maldonado y Horacio Machado* (pp. 57-81). Editorial Universidad del Rosario.
- Maldonado, C. (2017). La extraña idea del desarrollo. Genealogía de un concepto. *Pensamiento Americano*, 144-160.
- Martínez, J. (2023). Políticas públicas para la economía social solidaria en Colombia en tiempos de pandemia y crisis del neoliberalismo. *Cooperativismo y Desarrollo*, 31(125), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.16925/2382-4220.2023.01.04>
- Martínez, J. (2017). Políticas públicas para la economía solidaria en Colombia, antecedentes y perspectivas en el posconflicto. *Revista de Estudios Cooperativos*, (123), 174-197. doi.org/10.5209/REVE.54918
- Moulaert, F. and Ailenei, O. (2005). Social economy, third sector, and solidarity relations: a conceptual synthesis from history to present. *Urban Studies*, 42(11), 2037-2053.
- Matarrita, D., Trejos, B., Qin, H., Joo, D. and Debner, S. (2022). Conceptualizing community resilience: Revisiting conceptual distinctions. In *Community Development for Times of Crisis* (pp. 34-55). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003212652>
- Morandera, J., Etxezarreta, E., Azurza, O. e Izagirre, J. (2024). Social innovation for a new energy model, from theory to action: contributions from the social and solidarity economy in the Basque Country. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 37(1), 33-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2021.1890549>
- North, P. and Longhurst, N. (2016). Social innovation, community currencies, and the sustainability of an alternative food network. *Sustainability*, 8(6), 551.

- North, P. (2013). Assessing the social impact of community development: developing a New Zealand perspective. *Community Development Journal*, 48(2), 284-300.
- OECD. Local Economic & Employment Development (LEED). (2023a). The social and solidarity economy as a partner along the refugee journey. *Working Papers*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/174514e3-en>
- OECD. Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED). (2023b). Promoting internationalization of the social and solidarity economy: from local to global. *Working Papers*, p. 1-59. <https://doi.org/10.1787/7287db10-en>
- Osorio, M. y Rojas, M (2023). La economía social solidaria y el poder comunitario en la co-construcción de políticas públicas: Caso de la comunidad Vicente Guerrero, Tlaxcala, México. *Cooperativismo y Desarrollo*, 31(126), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.16925/2382-4220.2023.02.03>
- Pan, M. (2013). Beyond citations: Scholars' visibility on the social web. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 64(5), 1001-1019.
- Peña, G. y Rodríguez, P. (2018). Empoderamiento femenino a través de la inclusión financiera: un estudio de caso en Cali, Colombia. *Contaduría y Administración*, 63(2), 365-384.
- Pérez, E. y Farh, M. (2006). Nueva ruralidad: enfoques y propuestas para América Latina (pp. 77-126). Colección Estudios e Investigaciones. Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo Sustentable y la Soberanía Alimentaria. Cámara de Diputados LX Legislatura. México.
- Pérez, C. (2014). Debates conceptuales y aspectos organizativos de la economía solidaria: el caso de REAS EUSKADI (tesis de doctorado). Universidad del País Vasco, Vitoria-Gasteiz. <https://bit.ly/3OKHITB>
- Pérez, E. (2004). El mundo rural latinoamericano y la nueva ruralidad. *Nómadas* 20,180-193.
- Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation*. Beacon Press.
- Restrepo, E. y Álvarez, L. (2019). Desarrollo de la economía solidaria en Medellín: retos y perspectivas. *Revista Virtual Universidad Católica del Norte*, (56), 130-148.
- Ridley, D. (2008). *The literature review: a step-by-step guide for students*. Sage.
- Rincón, M. y Gómez, D. (2023). Cambio y aprendizaje organizacional, revisión documental. *Revista CIES*, 14(2) 27-49.
- Rendón J. y Gómez, D. (2022). Paisaje, territorio y agroindustria. El caso de la palma de aceite en Aracataca (Magdalena, Colombia). En *Las agrociencias en la dimensión de paisajes sostenibles*. Editorial Universidad de La Salle.
- Rendón J. y Gómez, D. (2020). Circuitos cortos y verdes. Alimentos sí hay. *Revista sur*. Obtenido en <https://www.sur.org.co/circuitos-cortos-y-verdes-alimentos-si-hay/>
- Rendón, J. (2017a). Economía y nueva ruralidad. En G. Correa. *Agrociencias y territorio* (pp. 35-50). Editorial Universidad de La Salle
- Rendón, J. (2017b). Pensar la economía en torno a la naturaleza. Prólogo. En Francisco Correa Restrepo, *Desarrollo sostenible: revisión teórica desde la economía*. Medellín: Universidad Autónoma Latinoamericana - Ediciones UNAULA
- Rodríguez, D. Laverde, M. y Pérez, E. (2021). Short commercialization circuits in local supply chains: economic revival in the pandemic. *South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics*, 12(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.9734/sajsse/2021/v12i230299>
- Rubio, G., Téllez, C. y Gómez, D. (2019). Análisis de los factores que componen un sistema de gestión empresarial: estudio de caso para la Dirección de Vivienda.

- Revista Nacional de Administración*, 10(2), 47-60. <https://doi.org/10.22458/rna.v10i2.2730>
- Ruiz, J. (1996). *Metodología de la investigación cualitativa*. Ediciones de la Universidad de Deusto.
- Rushforth, A. (2016). All or nothing? Debating the role of evaluative bibliometrics in the research system. *Research Evaluation*, 25(2), 230-231. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvw004>
- Sak, B. (2021). From collective interest through ‘solidarity perimeters’ up to social economy and common welfare: which new or further research lines? *Zeitschrift Für Öffentliche Und Gemeinwirtschaftliche Unternehmen: ZögU / Journal for Public and Nonprofit Services*, 44(1), 104-118. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27284045>
- Seyfang, G. y Haxeltine, A. (2012). Growing grassroots innovations: exploring the role of community-based initiatives in governing sustainable energy transitions. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 30(3), 381-400.
- Serntedakis, G. (2017). ‘Solidarity’ for strangers: a case study of ‘solidarity’ initiatives in Lesvos. *Etnofoor*, 29(2), 83-98. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26296171>
- Schlegel, J. (2022). Community and economic change in America: Buffalo, Queen City of the Great Lakes. In *While waiting for rain: community, economy, and law in a time of change* (pp. 95-186). University of Michigan Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3998/mpub.12158309.6>
- Smith, A. and Stirling, A. (2010). The politics of social-ecological resilience and sustainable socio-technical transitions. *Ecology and Society*, 15(1), 11.
- Socarrás, L. y Cantillo, E. (2019). Economía solidaria en Barranquilla: una mirada desde la Fundación Mario Santo Domingo. *Cuadernos de Desarrollo Rural*, 16(85).
- Thompson, E. (1966). *The making of the english working class*. Vintage.
- Tijssen, R. and Winnink, J. (2016). Twenty-first century macro-trends in the institutional fabric of science: bibliometric monitoring and analysis. *Scientometrics*, (109), 2181-2194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2041-z>
- Todeschini, R. (2016). *Handbook of bibliometric indicators: quantitative tools for studying and evaluating research*. Winheim.
- Uniagustiniana. (2023). *Segunda asociación formalizada gracias a un proyecto de investigación en la Uniagustiniana*. Uniagustiniana. Obtenido de <https://www.uniagustiniana.edu.co/noticias/segunda-asociacion-formalizada-gracias-un-proyecto-de-investigacion-en-la-uniagustiniana>
- Vaillancourt, Y. (2011). La economía social en la coproducción y la co-construcción de las políticas públicas. *Revista del Centro de Estudios de Sociología del Trabajo*, (3), 31-69.
- Vidal, C., Aleixandre, R. y Valderrama, J. (2024). Evolución de las tesis doctorales en documentación, Documentación automatizada y bibliometría en España: un estudio de género. *Revista Española de Documentación Científica*, 47(1), e379-e379. <https://doaj.org/article/deca7a966bda48dda90e0420647bbcd9>
- Vidal, V. (2022). Building a collaborative community economy: the case of La Comunicadora. In P. Travlou and L. Ciolfi (eds.), *Ethnographies of collaborative economies across Europe: understanding sharing and caring* (pp. 109-124). Ubiquity Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv35chj3q.11>
- Weingart, P. (2005). Impact of bibliometrics upon the science system: ¿Inadvertent consequences? *Scientometrics*, 62(1), 117-131.

Whyte, W. and Whyte, K. (1991). *Making Mondragón: the growth and dynamics of the worker cooperative complex*. Cornell University Press.

Wright, C. (2021). Marxism and the solidarity economy: toward a new theory of revolution. *Class, Race and Corporate Power*, 9(1). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48644426>

ANNEX 1. BIBLIOMETRIC EQUATIONS

Table 1. Example of search equation for the COMMUNITY ECONOMY OR COMMUNITY ECONOMY Category

DATABASE	SEARCH EQUATIONS
WoS	<p>Tema: (“ECONOMÍA COMUNITARIA OR COMMUNITY ECONOMY”)</p> <p>Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, AyHCI, ESCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p> <p>Tema: (“ECONOMÍA COMUNITARIA OR COMMUNITY ECONOMY”)</p> <p>Refinado por: Años de publicación: (2016 OR 2017 OR 2010 OR 2013 OR 2015 OR 2012 OR 2009 OR 2011 OR 2014 OR 2008 OR 2020 OR 2021 OR 2022 OR 2019 OR 2018 OR 2006 OR 2005 OR 2004 OR 2003 OR 2002 OR 2001 OR 2000)</p> <p>Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, AyHCI, ESCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p> <p>Tema: (“ECONOMÍA COMUNITARIA OR COMMUNITY ECONOMY”)</p> <p>Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, ESCI, AyHCI, SSCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p>
Scopus	<p>TITLE-ABS-KEY (“ECONOMÍA COMUNITARIA OR COMMUNITY ECONOMY”)</p> <p>TITLE-ABS-KEY (“ECONOMÍA COMUNITARIA OR COMMUNITY ECONOMY ”))</p> <p>TITLE-ABS-KEY ((“ECONOMÍA COMUNITARIA OR COMMUNITY ECONOMY “) AND (LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR , 2018) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2017) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2016) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2015) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2014) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2013) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2012) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2011) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2010) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2009) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2008) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2000) OR LIMIT-</p>

Table 2. Example of search equation for the Category ECONOMÍA SOLIDARIA OR SOLIDARITY ECONOMY

DATABASE	SEARCH EQUATIONS
WoS	<p>Tema: (“ECONOMÍA SOLIDARIA OR SOLIDARITY ECONOMY”)</p> <p>Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, AyHCI, ESCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p> <p>Tema: (“ECONOMÍA SOLIDARIA OR SOLIDARITY ECONOMY”)</p> <p>Refinado por: Años de publicación: (2016 OR 2017 OR 2010 OR 2013 OR 2015 OR 2012 OR 2009 OR 2011 OR 2014 OR 2008 OR 2020 OR 2021 OR 2022 OR 2019 OR 2018 OR 2006 OR 2005 OR 2004 OR 2003 OR 2002 OR 2001 OR 2000)</p> <p>Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, AyHCI, ESCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p> <p>Tema: (“ECONOMÍA SOLIDARIA OR SOLIDARITY ECONOMY”)</p> <p>Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, ESCI, AyHCI, SSCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p>
Scopus	<p>TITLE-ABS-KEY (“ECONOMÍA SOLIDARIA OR SOLIDARITY ECONOMY”)</p> <p>TITLE-ABS-KEY (“ECONOMÍA SOLIDARIA OR SOLIDARITY ECONOMY”))</p> <p>TITLE-ABS-KEY ((“ECONOMÍA SOLIDARIA OR SOLIDARITY ECONOMY “) AND (LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR , 2018) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2017) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2016) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2015) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2014) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2013) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2012) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2011) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2010) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2009) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2008) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2000) OR LIMIT-</p>

Table 3. Example of search equation for the Category NEW RURALITIES OR NEW RURALITIES

DATABASE	SEARCH EQUATIONS
WoS	<p>Tema: (“NUEVAS RURALIDADES OR NEW RURALITIES”)) Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, AyHCI, ESCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p> <p>Tema: (“NUEVAS RURALIDADES OR NEW RURALITIES”)) Refinado por: Años de publicación: (2016 OR 2017 OR 2010 OR 2013 OR 2015 OR 2012 OR 2009 OR 2011 OR 2014 OR 2008 OR 2020 OR 2021 02 2022 OR 2019 OR 2018 OR 2006 OR 2005 OR 2004 OR 2003 OR 2002 02 2001 OR 2000) Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, AyHCI, ESCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p> <p>Tema: (“NUEVAS RURALIDADES OR NEW RURALITIES”) Índices=SCI-EXPANDED, ESCI, AyHCI, SSCI Período de tiempo=Todos los años</p>
Scopus	<p>TITLE-ABS-KEY (“NUEVAS RURALIDADES OR NEW RURALITIES”)</p> <p>TITLE-ABS-KEY (“NUEVAS RURALIDADES OR NEW RURALITIES”))</p> <p>TITLE-ABS-KEY (“NUEVAS RURALIDADES OR NEW RURALITIES”) AND (LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2018) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2017) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2016) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2015) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2014) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2013) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2012) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2011) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2010) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2009) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2008) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2000) OR LIMIT-</p>