

Youth Entrepreneurship in the Digital Era: A Systematic Review and Capability Formation-Activation Framework

By James Wang

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

James Wang is a high school student at West Point Grey Academy in Vancouver, Canada, with interests spanning entrepreneurship, technology, operations research, and environmental systems. His research focuses on youth entrepreneurship education and how digital technologies and artificial intelligence can improve young people's ability to develop, evaluate, and build early-stage ventures.

ABSTRACT

Many young people express interest in becoming entrepreneurs, but far fewer go on to start and sustain a venture. This review examines why by synthesizing 115 peer-reviewed articles from three related areas often studied separately: young people's entrepreneurial motivation, entrepreneurship education, and the role of digital platforms and AI in starting ventures. Using the Search, Appraisal, Synthesis, and Analysis (SALSA) framework, the review finds that entrepreneurial intention matters but does not reliably predict action. Instead, whether intention becomes action depends on access to finance, networks, institutional legitimacy, and opportunities to test ideas at manageable risk. Entrepreneurship education, in turn, can build self-efficacy, opportunity recognition, and decision-making skills, particularly through experiential learning, but its effect on venture creation remains unclear because most existing studies end before later entrepreneurial activity can be observed. Digital platforms and generative AI may relax some of these constraints by reducing the costs of information, experimentation, and market access. However, they can also create reliance on platforms and encourage young founders to trust AI outputs they cannot yet assess. Drawing these findings together, the review develops a capability formation-activation framework that treats intention as revisable and separates the capabilities young people develop from the conditions needed to use them. The framework clarifies why capability does not consistently lead to action, and suggests that programs and digital tools should be judged not only by whether they raise entrepreneurial intention or technology use, but by whether they help young people persist, adapt, and decide responsibly when to stop.

Keywords: *Youth entrepreneurship; Entrepreneurial intention; Entrepreneurial education; Digital entrepreneurship; Systematic literature review.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Youth entrepreneurs, often defined as individuals transitioning from adolescence to early adulthood (e.g., Fubah et al., 2025), have attracted growing scholarly and policy attention as entrepreneurship is increasingly viewed as a response to youth unemployment, economic exclusion, and sustainable development challenges (Bilewicz & Tsimayeu, 2021; Huang et al., 2022; Urbano et al., 2020). Although age thresholds vary across contexts, the literature generally recognizes that entrepreneurial activity during this life stage is shaped by education, identity formation, constrained access to resources, and evolving opportunity structures.

Compared with older founders, young entrepreneurs generally begin with fewer accumulated resources. They tend to have less managerial experience, smaller professional networks, more limited access to finance, and less experience evaluating risk under uncertainty (Azoulay et al., 2020; Fubah et al., 2025). Studies identify access to finance as a persistent constraint on youth enterprise creation and growth (Ahmed & Ahmed, 2021; Amha, 2015; Boateng et al., 2014; Fatoki & Chindoga, 2011; Madu & Okeche, 2017; Nyanga, 2013). Other research emphasizes limited business skills, infrastructure, market access, networks, and institutional support (Aya et al., 2018; Chiloane-Tsoka & Botha, 2015; Dzisi, 2014; Gwija et al., 2014; Okirigiti & Rafey, 2015; Sambo, 2015, 2016). These disadvantages suggest that youth entrepreneurship programs should complement efforts to strengthen motivation with opportunities to develop industry knowledge, professional networks, and decision-making judgment.

These constraints are also contextual. Families, schools, communities, and financial systems influence whether young people can test an idea, learn from failure, access resources, and establish legitimacy. Two young people with similar motivation may therefore face very different entrepreneurial prospects because one has access to mentors, finance, and trusted networks while the other does not. Youth entrepreneurship cannot, for this reason, be explained solely at the individual level.

Much of the literature begins with entrepreneurial intention. The Theory of Planned Behavior and related models link attitudes, perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, and social norms to youth entrepreneurial aspiration. These models explain why some young people are more attracted to entrepreneurship than others, but they explain less about what happens next. Studies continue to report a substantial intention-action gap, and longitudinal evidence shows that the conversion of intention into start-up

activity depends on institutional and feasibility conditions (Fubah et al., 2025; Shirokova et al., 2022). Intention is therefore relevant, but it is not equivalent to action.

Entrepreneurship education is commonly proposed as the bridge between aspiration and action. The field has expanded beyond business schools into secondary education, vocational training, and community programs (Thomas, 2023). It also increasingly emphasizes opportunity recognition, judgment, resilience, and responsible value creation rather than business-plan preparation alone (Iyortsuun et al., 2021; Kakouris & Liargovas, 2021; Karimi et al., 2016; Larsen & Kaspersen, 2022). Studies frequently report positive changes in entrepreneurial intention or self-efficacy following entrepreneurship education. Because these measures are usually collected during or shortly after a program, they do not establish that participants later create or sustain viable ventures.

Digitalization further changes the problem. Digital platforms can widen access to information, customers, and infrastructure, while new technologies enable business models that were previously unavailable to resource-constrained founders (Steininger, 2019; von Briel et al., 2018; Yeganegi et al., 2021). Generative AI may reduce the time and cost associated with content production, preliminary analysis, customer interaction, and rapid experimentation, but existing studies have not yet established its effects on venture quality, founder learning, or long-term performance (Kusetogullari et al., 2025). Among young high-growth entrepreneurs, the benefits of AI adoption also depend on technology readiness and acceptance (Games et al., 2026). At the same time, digital markets intensify competition and shift dependence from traditional gatekeepers to platforms, algorithms, and technical infrastructures (Elia et al., 2020; Mir et al., 2023). These changes require entrepreneurial, digital, and managerial capabilities that are not well integrated in current education research (Kraus et al., 2019; Ratten & Jones, 2021; Sreenivasan & Suresh, 2023; Zaheer et al., 2019).

Entrepreneurship research is distributed across multiple disciplinary and theoretical streams, and youth entrepreneurship studies frequently examine intention, education, and digital entrepreneurship separately (Fubah et al., 2025; Garcia-Lillo et al., 2023). Sustainability is also frequently presented as a policy objective, but it remains inconsistently defined and measured in youth entrepreneurship research (Alzate et al., 2024; Rosário & Raimundo, 2024). A recent systematic review of youth entrepreneurial behavior reaches a related conclusion, emphasizing that entrepreneurial outcomes are shaped by the combined influence of personal, educational, social, and institutional factors rather than by any single predictor (Arunkumar et al., 2025).

This review examines how reliably entrepreneurial intentions predict later action and why those intentions change over time. It also considers what capabilities entrepreneurship education appears to develop and whether those capabilities influence later entrepreneurial activity. The role of digital technologies, including

artificial intelligence, is examined in relation to the opportunities, constraints, and learning processes facing young entrepreneurs.

The synthesis indicates that education, experience, and digital practice can contribute to entrepreneurial knowledge, judgment, confidence, and execution skills. Their development does not, however, ensure entrepreneurial action. Young people must also have access to feasible opportunities, resources, institutional support, and conditions under which they can experiment without unacceptable loss. Digital tools may relax some constraints while creating new dependencies.

The paper makes three contributions. First, it brings intention, education, and digital entrepreneurship research into one analytical discussion while preserving the tensions within each stream. Second, it proposes a framework that treats intention as revisable and separates what young people are able to do from whether their environment permits them to do it. Third, it identifies a research agenda centered on longitudinal evidence, the durability of educational effects, digital dependence, and the measurement of inclusive and sustainable outcomes.

Section 2 explains the review method. Sections 3, 4, and 5 examine entrepreneurial intention, entrepreneurship education, and digital technologies respectively. Section 6 develops the capability formation-activation framework and discusses research and practical implications. The final section states the main conclusion and the limits of the review.

2. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This study adopts a concept-driven, semi-structured systematic literature review using the Search, Appraisal, Synthesis, and Analysis (SALSA) framework. SALSA provides a structured process for identifying, screening, synthesizing, and interpreting an interdisciplinary body of literature (Booth et al., 2022; Grant & Booth, 2009). The framework is well suited to youth entrepreneurship research because the field draws on multiple disciplines, employs different units of analysis and outcome measures, and remains theoretically fragmented. Following Snyder (2019), the purpose of the review is not to aggregate effect sizes but to determine what can reasonably be concluded across these differences, where the evidence remains contested, and which relationships require further investigation.

2.1 Search

The Search phase was designed to identify a comprehensive and representative body of peer-reviewed literature on youth entrepreneurship while accommodating the field's interdisciplinary scope and rapid

FALL 2026

evolution. The review focused on three interrelated thematic domains: (1) youth entrepreneurial intentions and motivation, (2) entrepreneurial education and competency development, and (3) technology-enabled entrepreneurship, with particular emphasis on social media, artificial intelligence, and generative AI. An initial scan of existing systematic and narrative reviews informed database selection, keyword refinement, and conceptual boundary setting.

Building on this scoping exercise, preliminary and full searches were conducted across EBSCO, ProQuest, Emerald, Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The search targeted peer-reviewed journal articles published in English across relevant disciplinary areas, including business and management, economics, social sciences, education, and information systems. No restrictions were imposed on journal outlets or methodological approaches, consistent with established recommendations for reviewing fragmented entrepreneurship research domains (Zaheer et al., 2019).

Search terms were selected to capture both established constructs and emerging research frontiers and included *young entrepreneur**, *youth entrepreneur**, and *student entrepreneur**. Keyword combinations were refined iteratively and guided by best practices for concept-driven systematic literature reviews (Kraus et al., 2020; Paré et al., 2024; Templier & Paré, 2015). To enhance coverage and reduce omission bias, backward and forward citation searches were applied recursively until conceptual saturation was reached (Webster & Watson, 2002).

2.2 Appraisal

In the Appraisal phase, retrieved records were systematically screened to assess relevance and scholarly quality using predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. First, titles and keywords were reviewed to ensure that youth or young entrepreneurs constituted the primary unit of analysis. Second, abstracts were examined to assess whether studies substantively addressed at least one focal area, and whether they offered a clear theoretical, empirical, or methodological contribution. Studies were excluded if youth entrepreneurship was peripheral, if the work was purely descriptive, or if it lacked analytical grounding. Full-text screening was conducted for ambiguous cases, and backward and forward citation searches were used to identify additional influential studies not captured through keyword searches. This process resulted in a final sample of 115 peer-reviewed articles.

2.3 Synthesis

The selected articles were synthesized by concept. Within each domain, the analysis compared the principal theories, research designs, outcome measures, mechanisms, and empirical findings. This approach made it possible to distinguish recurring patterns from conclusions supported by only a limited number of

studies and to retain disagreements that might be obscured by a purely descriptive review (Paré et al., 2024; Templier & Paré, 2015). The process focused on the outcome examined, the proposed explanatory mechanism, the level of analysis, the relevant contextual conditions, and the strength and limitations of the research design.

Particular care was taken when interpreting evidence that was not directly specific to youth. Broader digital entrepreneurship and artificial intelligence research was used to identify potentially relevant mechanisms, but it was not treated as direct evidence about young entrepreneurs. Sustainability was approached in the same manner: it was treated as an outcome requiring explicit definition and measurement rather than as an inherent characteristic of youth-led entrepreneurial activity.

2.4 Analysis

The final stage compared evidence across the three domains to identify where the literatures offered complementary explanations and where similar concepts were being used to describe different processes. Particular attention was given to the distinction among the formation of entrepreneurial motivation, the development of entrepreneurial capability, and the conditions that permit those capabilities to be used in practice. This distinction became central because many studies report changes in intention, attitude, or self-efficacy without observing subsequent entrepreneurial behavior.

Contradictory findings and methodological limitations were retained as part of the analysis. Differences were examined in relation to the outcome measured, the timing of measurement, the type of educational intervention, the population studied, and the relevant institutional and digital context. The framework developed in Section 6 should therefore be understood as an interpretive synthesis of the reviewed evidence. It identifies relationships and distinctions that require empirical testing rather than presenting a causal model already established by the literature.

3. YOUTH ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS AND MOTIVATION

Entrepreneurial intention remains the dominant starting point in youth entrepreneurship research. The Theory of Planned Behavior explains intention through attitudes, perceived behavioral control, and subjective norms (Ajzen, 1991). This approach is useful for explaining why stated entrepreneurial aspiration varies across individuals and contexts. Most applications, however, measure what young people say they intend to do rather than whether they subsequently start, sustain, or exit a venture.

3.1 Intention-Based Perspectives

Intention models are attractive because they are conceptually straightforward and readily tested through surveys. Numerous studies confirm that entrepreneurial attitudes, self-efficacy (i.e. an individual's belief in his or her ability to succeed as an entrepreneur, Chang et al., 2020), and social norms significantly predict entrepreneurial intentions among young people. Yet systematic reviews consistently highlight a dominant reliance on cross-sectional designs and self-reported measures, limiting insight into how intentions evolve over time or translate into sustained entrepreneurial action (Fubah et al., 2025). As a result, a persistent intention-behavior gap remains one of the most widely documented empirical challenges in youth entrepreneurship research.

Evidence across institutional contexts demonstrates that the relationship between intention and action is contingent. That is, entrepreneurial intention functions as a necessary but insufficient condition for action in the absence of enabling feasibility structures. Longitudinal, cross-country evidence from the Global University Entrepreneurial Spirit Students' Survey (GUESSS) shows that strong legal institutions significantly strengthen the translation of entrepreneurial intentions into start-up activity, while financial market institutions play a more limited role (Shirokova et al., 2022). Similarly, evidence from Europe and emerging economies identifies structural barriers, such as limited access to finance, regulatory complexity, insufficient entrepreneurial skills, and unfavorable business environments, that constrain entrepreneurial enactment even when intentions are present (Ceptureanu & Ceptureanu, 2015; Ridzwan et al., 2017). At a broader level, institutional research shows that formal and informal institutions shape opportunity recognition, legitimacy, and entrepreneurial incentives (Urbano et al., 2019). Entrepreneurial intention therefore predicts youth entrepreneurial behavior only conditionally. Its translation into action depends on legal institutions, access to resources, entrepreneurial skills, and the broader feasibility of venture entry (Ceptureanu & Ceptureanu, 2015; Ridzwan et al., 2017; Shirokova et al., 2022; Urbano et al., 2019).

3.2 Extending Intention Models: Capabilities, Education, and Context

Recent studies extend traditional intention models by incorporating education, experience, digital knowledge, and contextual support. In digital entrepreneurship contexts, policy and education influence entrepreneurial intention partly by shaping perceived feasibility and social norms (Lai & To, 2020). Digital entrepreneurship education is also associated with stronger opportunity recognition (Wibowo et al., 2023), while TPB-based research shows that institutional and contextual support remains important in digital settings (Al-Mamary & Alraja, 2022). Integrated intention models similarly indicate that individual and contextual factors operate together rather than independently (Gulzar & Fayaz, 2023). These findings strengthen the explanation of how entrepreneurial aspiration is formed, but most studies still treat intention as the primary

outcome. They therefore provide less evidence about whether young people subsequently enter, sustain, or grow a venture.

Informal social structures further shape this relationship. Family support can increase the perceived desirability and feasibility of entrepreneurship, although its effects vary across cultural and institutional contexts (Maleki et al., 2023). Family social capital may facilitate early start-up activity by providing resources, legitimacy, and access to networks, yet extensive financial support may also reduce the pressure to test assumptions and learn through constraint (Edelman et al., 2016). Evidence from emerging economies likewise links entrepreneurial intention to self-efficacy, family and peer support, institutional conditions, skills, innovativeness, and risk-taking (Martins et al., 2023; Nungsari et al., 2023). Family influence has also been identified as a distinct factor in digital entrepreneurial intention in emerging-market settings (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2024a). The evidence therefore does not suggest that family support is uniformly beneficial. Its effects depend on the type of support provided, the surrounding institutional context, and the entrepreneurial behavior that the support enables.

Young people do not necessarily accumulate all relevant capabilities before acting. They often begin through bootstrapping, effectuation, and family-based resource mobilization, and develop knowledge through the venture process itself (Hulsink & Koek, 2014). Prior start-up and work experience are associated with stronger entrepreneurial intention, as is entrepreneurship education, while peer influence may weaken motivation in settings characterized by competition and fear of failure (Bignotti & Le Roux, 2020). Action can therefore be an input into capability development, not only its final outcome.

Resilience and emotional factors are also relevant, particularly when unemployment is high and failure is costly. Resilience is associated with stronger intention and lower fear of failure (Ukil & Jenkins, 2023). Psychological characteristics also predict preparation behaviors such as information gathering and planning (Wardana et al., 2020). These studies move closer to action than intention surveys alone, but preparation should still not be treated as equivalent to venture entry or persistence.

3.3 Developmental and Values-Based Perspectives

Developmental research offers a different interpretation of intention. From a Relational Developmental Systems perspective, entrepreneurial aspirations emerge through continuing interaction between young people and their educational, social, and institutional environments (Geldhof et al., 2014a, 2014b, 2016). Longitudinal research likewise shows that intention and action can co-evolve through experimentation, learning, and failure (Shaw & Sørensen, 2022). This evidence supports a shift away from static trait explanations toward processes in which identity, efficacy, and perceived feasibility are repeatedly revised (Gorgievski & Stephan, 2016).

A life-cycle perspective also explains why delayed entrepreneurial entry may be rational. Young people may wait while they accumulate information, experience, and income security; early education can still produce long-term benefits even when it does not lead to immediate entry (Hincapié, 2020). Exposure to supportive learning ecosystems during adolescence may also affect later commitment and technology-oriented career choices (Chen et al., 2024; Damon et al., 2015). Timing matters - a decline in short-term intention is not necessarily evidence that an educational or developmental intervention has failed.

Youth motivations are also different. Some young people pursue an identified market opportunity; others enter entrepreneurship because employment options are limited (Fubah et al., 2025). Necessity-based entry may later develop into opportunity-based activity when education and institutional resources become available (Biney, 2023). Social impact, identity, community development, and environmental concerns can also shape entrepreneurial choices (Alzate et al., 2024; Celestin & Vanitha, 2018; Gomes et al., 2025). These motives often coexist. They should not be reduced to a single opportunity-necessity distinction. Values and legitimacy may also be shaped by religion and socio-cultural capital, although these effects are context-specific and should not be generalized across youth populations (Dvouletý, 2023; Pillai & Ahamat, 2018).

3.4 Synthesis: Intention as a Revisable State

The reviewed studies do not establish a single cause of the intention-action gap. They do show that intention becomes a weaker predictor when young people lack skills, finance, networks, institutional legitimacy, or opportunities to test an idea at manageable cost (Ceptureanu & Ceptureanu, 2015; Ridzwan et al., 2017; Shirokova et al., 2022; Urbano et al., 2019). Education, digital knowledge, family support, resilience, and prior experience can alter perceived feasibility and preparation behavior (Al-Mamary & Alraja, 2022; Edelman et al., 2016; Lai & To, 2020; Maleki et al., 2023; Ukil & Jenkins, 2023; Wardana et al., 2020; Wibowo et al., 2023).

Entrepreneurial intention is therefore better understood as a revisable orientation. It may strengthen, weaken, or change direction as young people acquire information, revise their identities, encounter constraints, and reassess the feasibility of entrepreneurship (Alzate et al., 2024; Celestin & Vanitha, 2018; Damon et al., 2015; Geldhof et al., 2014a, 2014b, 2016; Gomes et al., 2025; Shaw & Sørensen, 2022).

4. ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION AND COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT

The central question in entrepreneurship education is no longer simply whether entrepreneurship can be taught. It is what an intervention changes, how long that change lasts, and whether the change becomes visible in entrepreneurial behavior. This distinction matters because intention, self-efficacy, opportunity

recognition, venture entry, and persistence are different outcomes. An intervention may improve one outcome while having little immediate effect on another.

4.1 The Development and Effectiveness of Entrepreneurship Education

Entrepreneurship education has developed into a field spanning various levels of education (Kuratko, 2005). While earlier programs often emphasized business planning and venture creation, more recent approaches emphasize opportunity recognition, problem solving, resilience, adaptability, and judgment (Fubah et al., 2025). This broader orientation is sensible, but it also makes evaluation more difficult because programs differ substantially in content, pedagogy, and intended outcome.

Studies of entrepreneurship education report different effects. While many studies report positive associations with intention, attitude, or self-efficacy, the literature relies heavily on short-term and subjective measures (Nabi et al., 2017; Sreenivasan & Suresh, 2023). Higher education may also prioritize employability in ways that leave limited room for sustained entrepreneurial practice (Birch et al., 2017). An increase in average intention is therefore not treated as the principal test of educational quality. A course may also improve decision quality by making students more realistic about the demands of entrepreneurship. In that case, intention may fall even though learning has occurred. In addition, school-level review evidence remains mixed across entrepreneurial outcomes (Brüne & Lutz, 2020; García-Rodríguez et al., 2019), while targeted interventions show that entrepreneurial self-efficacy can be developed even when longer-term venture outcomes are not observed (Awotunde & van der Westhuizen, 2021). Program objectives and evaluation criteria should therefore reflect students' developmental stage, particularly in school-based entrepreneurship education (Lin et al., 2023).

Sustainability adds another educational objective. Programs that include ethical reasoning, systems thinking, and social and environmental awareness may support values-based business models (Celestin & Vanitha, 2018). Competence-based programs similarly identify problem solving, mentorship, digital enablement, and sustainability orientation as elements of responsible entrepreneurship (Pasi et al., 2025). These studies primarily document curriculum content and immediate educational outcomes rather than the later economic, social, or environmental performance of ventures. Sustainability outcomes therefore need to be measured rather than inferred from program design.

4.2 Experiential Learning and Capability Formation

The clearest pattern in the entrepreneurship education literature concerns pedagogy. Learning-by-doing, projects, simulations, incubation, and exposure to uncertainty allow students to test assumptions, receive feedback, and make decisions under incomplete information. These experiences are

associated with self-efficacy, resilience, judgment, and adaptability (Shaw & Sørensen, 2022). Capability formation may also occur through observing and interacting with other entrepreneurs, extending learning beyond formal educational programs (Guiso et al., 2021).

Mechanism-focused studies link experiential learning to entrepreneurial intention through self-efficacy and attitudes (Taneja et al., 2024), while large-scale program research associates it with skills, mindset, identity, and intention (Sholikhah et al., 2025). Most of these outcomes are measured during or shortly after the intervention. The studies therefore show that experiential education can influence participants' immediate perceptions and orientations, but they do not establish whether these effects persist or are later used in entrepreneurial settings (Nabi et al., 2017).

Integrated competence models help clarify what education may develop. Reis et al. (2021) combine cognitive, behavioral, and relational competences within a broader meta-competence framework, moving beyond the treatment of entrepreneurship as a collection of isolated technical skills. For this review, the most relevant capabilities are opportunity recognition and judgment, adaptive execution, relationship building, and ethical reflection. Education can support their development, but their later use depends on the conditions in which graduates act.

4.2.1 Family Embeddedness and Institutional Support

Students from entrepreneurial families may benefit more because they can connect classroom learning to existing knowledge, networks, and examples of practice (Hahn et al., 2020). Others may develop capability through bootstrapping, effectuation, and early experimentation when formal education and financial resources are limited (Hulsink & Koek, 2014). These different pathways suggest that educational research should account for the resources students bring into a program rather than attributing all subsequent differences to the intervention itself.

The quality and fit of external support also matter. Youth entrepreneurs commonly require mentoring, networks, business knowledge, and context-specific advice, and private support centers may sometimes provide more tailored assistance than public programs (Moos et al., 2022). Mentoring research similarly emphasizes sustained guidance, feedback, and individualized support rather than one-time information provision (Prastyaningtyas et al., 2023). Education may develop knowledge and judgment, but students still require appropriate settings in which to apply what they have learned.

4.2.2 Digital Entrepreneurship Education and AI-Mediated Learning

Entrepreneurship education must increasingly reflect the conditions of digital venturing. Conventional business-plan exercises do not expose students to platform rules, rapid customer feedback, online reputation, digital experimentation, or technology-adoption decisions. Research therefore favors simulations, projects, and venture-based activities that make these conditions visible (Sitaridis & Kitsios, 2024).

The effectiveness of online entrepreneurship programs depends on more than learners' willingness to participate. Organizational and environmental conditions may be more influential than innovation-related attitudes (Wang & Chiou, 2020). Digital entrepreneurship education is associated with entrepreneurial alertness and opportunity recognition (Wibowo et al., 2023), but most studies measure intention or perceived capability. They provide less evidence about whether students subsequently use digital information to improve market, product, or resource-allocation decisions.

Artificial intelligence introduces an additional pedagogical challenge. Although Mariani et al. (2023) do not examine youth entrepreneurship education specifically, their review suggests that conversational agents can support feedback, idea exploration, and decision practice when appropriately designed and supervised. Young people also recognize both the opportunities and the ethical and career risks associated with AI and machine learning (Kaszuba-Perz et al., 2025). Generative-AI-supported education has been associated with stronger self-efficacy when university support is available (Xie & Wang, 2025), but existing studies do not establish that students develop stronger independent judgment or subsequently create more viable ventures.

The educational objective should not be to maximize the use of digital tools, but to develop disciplined and accountable use. Students should learn when technology can accelerate information gathering and experimentation, when its outputs require verification, and when delegation may weaken the development of independent judgment. Digital entrepreneurship education should also make rights, responsibilities, privacy, and accountable participation explicit elements of capability development (Gallego-Arrufat et al., 2023).

4.3 Learning Pathways Beyond the Classroom

Education alone is unlikely to produce sustained entrepreneurial action. Mentoring, finance, policy, and network access affect whether students can continue experimenting after a course ends (Shaw & Sørensen, 2022). A socio-ecological review similarly identifies barriers across individual, interpersonal, community, and institutional levels, particularly in resource-constrained settings (Ofosu-Appiah et al., 2025). These conditions are not background variables. They determine whether newly developed capabilities can be used.

Learning also occurs through mentoring, peer networks, community programs, incubators, internships, student clubs, maker spaces, and digital platforms (Biney, 2023; Fubah et al., 2025). Online formats such as

MOOCs can widen access, but they have difficulty reproducing the uncertainty, accountability, and ecosystem interaction of real venture work (Sitaridis & Kitsios, 2024). The most credible educational pathways therefore connect formal instruction with repeated practice and external feedback.

4.4 Synthesis: What Education Can and Cannot Be Expected to Do

Education can contribute to opportunity recognition, self-efficacy, judgment, and execution skills, particularly when pedagogy is experiential (Ghannad & Sörensson, 2025). It may also produce more realistic self-assessment. Evidence that these changes lead to sustained entrepreneurial action is much weaker, because their use depends on timing, opportunity, and access to external support. Education can prepare a young person to act without ensuring that a feasible opportunity to act will arise.

Access to educational and entrepreneurial communities is uneven. Gender, socioeconomic background, and region affect legitimacy, resources, and network entry (Joshi et al., 2024). Programs that combine curriculum with mentoring, incubation, and policy support may be better positioned to assist under-resourced participants than stand-alone classroom interventions (Do Nguyen & Nguyen, 2023; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2024b). Existing studies do not provide sufficiently comparable long-term outcomes to determine whether these integrated programs improve venture persistence or sustainability.

Education should also address the period after intention. Self-regulation, coordination, persistence, and other volitional competencies shape the behavior of early-stage venture teams after commitment has been made (Taruona & Botha, 2026). Career shocks can also alter entry, persistence, and exit decisions (Rummel et al., 2021). Preparing students to revise or abandon an idea for good reasons is as important as preparing them to pursue one.

5. TECHNOLOGIES AND NEW DIGITAL TOOLS IN YOUTH ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Digital technologies have changed how entrepreneurial opportunities are identified, tested, financed, and delivered. These technologies can be particularly valuable to young entrepreneurs who often lack capital, established networks, and access to conventional support structures (Paul et al., 2023; Sim et al., 2023). Digital entrepreneurship research emphasizes opportunities grounded in digital artifacts, platforms, and infrastructures that enable scalability, broader market access, and rapid experimentation (Giones & Brem, 2017; Nambisan, 2017).

The relationship between information technology and entrepreneurship, however, predates the current expansion of digital platforms and artificial intelligence (Del Giudice & Straub, 2011). More recent research on

FALL 2026

digital academic entrepreneurship also shows that the commercialization of digitally enabled knowledge depends not only on technology itself but also on the institutional settings in which that technology is developed and applied (Secundo et al., 2020). These studies help explain the broader mechanisms through which digital technologies shape entrepreneurial activity.

Much of this literature is not specific to youth entrepreneurship. This review therefore distinguishes direct evidence concerning young entrepreneurs from broader digital entrepreneurship research that identifies mechanisms likely to be relevant to them (Kollmann et al., 2022). This distinction is important because evidence that digital technologies support entrepreneurship in general does not necessarily establish that young entrepreneurs have the capabilities, resources, or institutional support required to benefit from them.

5.1 Platforms and Social Media as Entrepreneurial Enablers

Social media and e-commerce platforms can reduce the cost of visibility, customer communication, and early market testing. Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, Etsy, and Amazon Marketplace allow a young founder to reach potential customers without first securing conventional retail distribution or a large advertising budget. These platforms can also serve as informal learning environments in which users observe competitors, test content, and receive rapid feedback (Celestin & Vanitha, 2018; Sirait et al., 2025). Lower entry cost, however, should not be confused with equal opportunity. Visibility remains governed by platform rules and algorithms.

Effective platform use also requires coordination. Entrepreneurs combine public social-media promotion with private messaging and customer-relationship practices, and value depends on how well these channels work together (Bellaaj, 2023). Information and system quality, trust, marketing activity, perceived creativity, and satisfaction are also related (Hamid et al., 2024). Platform access is therefore only the starting point. Young entrepreneurs must interpret data, coordinate communication, build credibility, and manage relationships across channels.

Crowdfunding provides a related example. Young entrepreneurs value it for visibility, communication, and early customer feedback, but limited knowledge of platform-specific funding models constrains more sophisticated use (Bernardino & Santos, 2020). Digital access may open a financing channel while leaving the user unable to exploit it fully. This is another instance in which access and capability should be separated.

5.2 Artificial Intelligence and Generative AI in Youth Entrepreneurship

Research on AI and entrepreneurship is expanding quickly, but evidence specific to young entrepreneurs remains limited. The broader literature identifies potential benefits in opportunity recognition,

information processing, decision support, operational efficiency, and new business-model design (Chalmers et al., 2021; Elia et al., 2020; Giuggioli & Pellegrini, 2023; Iansiti & Lakhani, 2020; Kusetogullari et al., 2025; Obschonka & Audretsch, 2020). These studies establish plausible mechanisms. They do not by themselves show that young entrepreneurs use AI effectively or that AI improves venture survival.

For young entrepreneurs, generative AI may reduce the time and cost of content production, preliminary analysis, customer communication, and early experimentation. Perceived effort and usefulness may jointly affect entrepreneurial motivation (Herani & Angela, 2025). Entrepreneurs in AI- and data-intensive contexts also tend to be highly connected digitally, which increases the importance of online engagement and social capital (Chae & Goh, 2020). Conversational agents can support idea exploration and interaction, but their contribution depends on reflective use and verification (Mariani et al., 2023).

AI use also creates direct risks related to accountability, bias, and decision delegation. AI systems may reproduce bias, obscure responsibility, and encourage users to delegate judgments they are not yet able to evaluate (Obschonka & Audretsch, 2020). Young entrepreneurs may be willing to adopt AI, but its benefits depend on integration capability and contextual readiness rather than adoption alone (Games et al., 2026). AI may therefore accelerate good experimentation or accelerate poor decisions. The difference lies in the user's judgment, the quality of the underlying information and oversight, and the consequences of error.

5.3 Business Model Innovation and Technology-Enabled Resilience

Technology adoption does not create value by itself. Digital tools become entrepreneurial resources when they support a workable value proposition, delivery process, and revenue model. Digitalization can make it easier to revise these elements through repeated testing (Caputo et al., 2021). For young entrepreneurs, the relevant advantage may be less the sophistication of the technology than the speed and cost at which assumptions can be tested and a business model revised.

Evidence from periods of disruption shows that young entrepreneurs used digital innovations to sustain and adapt small and medium-sized enterprises (Cueto et al., 2022; Secundo et al., 2021). The capacity to do so was uneven. Digital skills, infrastructure, platform competition, and access to complementary resources affected who benefited. Digitalization can support resilience, but it can also widen the difference between entrepreneurs who can reconfigure their businesses and those who merely gain access to the same tools.

5.4 Digital Ecosystems, Sustainability, and Inclusion

Digital entrepreneurial outcomes depend on systems of complementary actors, institutions, infrastructures, and resources (Stam & Van de Ven, 2021). Digital ecosystems add platform governance and digitally mediated networks to this institutional environment (Paul et al., 2023; Sitaridis & Kitsios, 2024). Research on digital transformation similarly shows that leadership, human capital, organizational learning, and process integration affect whether technology adoption improves performance (Titov et al., 2023). Innovation-systems research connects digital entrepreneurship to wider sustainability transitions, while other work describes entrepreneurs as processors and distributors of digital information (Sahut et al., 2021; Satalkina & Steiner, 2020).

Digital tools also interact with education and capability development. Platforms, simulations, and AI-enabled tools can support prototyping, market feedback, and experimentation (Sirait et al., 2025; Sitaridis & Kitsios, 2024). Their educational value depends on digital literacy, reflection, and ethical judgment (Larsen & Kaspersen, 2022). Digital technologies may improve efficiency, transparency, and stakeholder engagement, but unequal infrastructure, skills, and platform access can deepen existing inequalities (Holzmann & Gregori, 2023). Technology availability alone does not demonstrate inclusion. Evaluation must identify who gains access, who develops the capability to use that access, and who captures the resulting value (Paul et al., 2023; Sim et al., 2023).

5.5 Synthesis: Digital Tools Lower Some Barriers and Create Others

Digital technologies reduce some of the costs associated with information, market access, financing search, and experimentation (Bernardino & Santos, 2020; Paul et al., 2023; Sim et al., 2023). Their value depends on coordination capability, digital literacy, business-model judgment, and institutional support (Bellaaj, 2023; Hamid et al., 2024; Stam & Van de Ven, 2021). Lower entry barriers do not produce equal outcomes, as digital resilience and adaptation remain unevenly distributed (Cueto et al., 2022; Secundo et al., 2021).

Technology is neither an independent cause of entrepreneurship nor a neutral tool. Its effects depend on complementary organizational and ecosystem conditions (Satalkina & Steiner, 2020; Titov et al., 2023). AI makes this contingency particularly visible because it can expand opportunity while increasing dependence, ethical risk, and the speed of poor judgment (Giuggioli & Pellegrini, 2023; Kusetogullari et al., 2025; Obschonka & Audretsch, 2020). Digital technology is best understood as a conditional entrepreneurial resource whose value depends on the user's judgment and the institutional, organizational, and platform environment in which it is applied.

6. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH AGENDA

6.1 Integrative Findings

Read together, the reviewed literatures show that entrepreneurial aspiration, capability, and action are related but not interchangeable. Intention reflects a young person's current orientation toward entrepreneurship, yet it changes as new information, experience, and constraints alter perceived desirability and feasibility. Education may strengthen judgment, opportunity recognition, and execution skills without producing immediate venture entry. Digital technologies further reshape these processes by lowering some costs of experimentation and market access while creating new dependencies on platforms, algorithms, data, and technical infrastructures.

The intention-action gap should therefore not be interpreted simply as weak motivation. Young people may delay entry while accumulating experience, abandon an idea after learning more about its feasibility, or remain unable to act because finance, networks, legitimacy, or institutional support are unavailable. In such cases, a change in intention may reflect informed reassessment rather than failure.

The evidence on entrepreneurship education is more convincing for capability development than for venture creation. Experiential approaches can improve self-efficacy, opportunity recognition, judgment, and adaptive behavior, but most studies do not follow participants long enough to determine whether these effects persist or influence later entrepreneurial activity. Education can prepare a person to act without causing action. It can also improve the quality of a decision not to proceed.

Digital technologies change the cost, speed, and scope of entrepreneurial practice, but access alone does not determine value. Platforms and AI may make communication, experimentation, and market entry more affordable, yet their benefits depend on the user's ability to evaluate information, coordinate activities, and manage technological dependence. Where these capabilities are weak, apparent efficiency may come at the cost of learning, accountability, or decision quality.

These findings point to a separation between the development of entrepreneurial capability and the conditions required to use it. Motivation, education, experience, and digital practice may strengthen what a young person is able to do, but action remains dependent on feasible opportunities and access to complementary resources. Fubah et al. (2025) reach a compatible conclusion in constrained and high-unemployment contexts, where individual aspiration is repeatedly limited by structural conditions.

Cross-sectional studies consistently associate attitudes, self-efficacy, and support with entrepreneurial intention. Experiential research identifies mechanisms through which education may develop judgment and other entrepreneurial capabilities, while institutional and digital studies explain some of the conditions that

permit or constrain their use. These bodies of research do not establish the relative importance, durability, or causal ordering of the relationships because they examine different outcomes over different periods. Education may increase confidence, improve judgment, or recalibrate unrealistic expectations, but these effects are not equivalent. Digitalization may widen access while concentrating visibility and bargaining power in platforms, and AI may support learning or displace it depending on how its outputs are evaluated and governed.

Table 1 summarizes the principal perspectives represented in the literature, the contribution each makes, and the unresolved problem that prevents any one perspective from explaining youth entrepreneurial trajectories on its own. The table is not intended to rank theories. It clarifies why an integrated explanation is needed and where that explanation remains open to empirical testing.

Perspective	What it explains	Main contribution	Unresolved problem
Intention-based models	Variation in entrepreneurial aspiration	Attitudes, perceived control, norms, and self-efficacy	Limited evidence on change over time and the transition from intention to action
Education and capability research	What entrepreneurship programs may develop	Experiential learning, opportunity recognition, resilience, and judgment	Short follow-up periods and weak evidence linking learning to durable action
Psychological and developmental research	How motivation and identity change	Resilience, experience, identity formation, and life-course timing	Construct fragmentation and limited integration with structural constraints
Digital entrepreneurship research	How technologies alter opportunity and practice	Platforms, AI, experimentation, and business-model adaptation	Limited youth-specific evidence and insufficient analysis of dependence and governance
Ecosystem and institutional research	Why similar individuals face different feasibility conditions	Institutions, family support, mentoring, finance, and networks	Broad context measures and weak identification of stage-specific mechanisms
Sustainability and inclusion research	Distribution and quality of entrepreneurial outcomes	Social purpose, ethical judgment, and unequal access	Inconsistent definitions and limited outcome measurement

Table 1. Perspectives, Contributions, and Unresolved Problems in Youth Entrepreneurship Research

6.2 A Capability Formation-Activation Framework for Youth Entrepreneurship

This review proposes a capability formation-activation framework to organize the reviewed evidence presented in Table 2. The framework contains four process elements: a revisable intention state, capability formation through education and experience, activation conditions that permit entrepreneurial action, and feedback from action into later intention and capability. Digital conditions operate across these elements by altering access, the speed and cost of experimentation, and the risks associated with platform dependence, algorithmic bias, and delegated judgment.

Framework element	Core question	Illustrative mechanisms	Observable outcomes
Revisable intention state	Does the young person currently wish and expect to pursue entrepreneurship?	Desirability, feasibility, self-efficacy, identity, values, and feedback	Strengthening, weakening, delay, or redirection of intention
Capability formation	What can the young person understand and do?	Education, experience, mentoring, digital practice, and structured feedback	Opportunity evaluation, adaptive execution, relationship building, and ethical judgment
Capability activation	Can those capabilities be used in a viable setting?	Finance, networks, legitimacy, regulation, infrastructure, market access, and survivable experimentation	Venture entry, testing, persistence, informed exit, and adaptation
Feedback over time	How does action change later intention and capability?	Learning from customers, failure, ecosystem participation, and identity revision	Deepened capability, changed motivation, revised pathways, and longer-term value creation
Digital conditions	Which constraints are reduced and which dependencies are created?	Platforms, AI, data access, algorithms, verification, and governance	Faster experimentation, wider reach, platform dependence, bias, or capability erosion

Table 2. *Capability Formation-Activation Framework for Youth Entrepreneurship*

6.2.1 Intention, Capability Formation, and Activation

Intention represents a young person's current willingness to pursue entrepreneurship. It is influenced by perceived desirability, feasibility, self-efficacy, identity, and values, including social and environmental

commitments. The framework does not treat intention as a fixed antecedent. Rather, new information, education, work experience, failure, and changing family or labor-market circumstances can strengthen, weaken, or redirect it.

Capability formation refers to the development of knowledge and judgment that support entrepreneurial practice. Relevant capabilities include recognizing and evaluating opportunities, testing assumptions, coordinating action, building relationships and legitimacy, adapting under uncertainty, and considering ethical consequences. Education can contribute through experiential pedagogy, mentoring, and structured feedback. Experience and informal learning can develop the same capabilities through different routes.

Capability activation concerns whether these capabilities can be used in a real setting. Finance, networks, mentorship, regulatory clarity, trust, infrastructure, and market access influence activation. Digital platforms and AI may relax some constraints by lowering the cost of information and experimentation. They may also impose new constraints through platform dependence, competition, bias, weak accountability, and technical failure. Technology is therefore part of the activation environment as well as a potential source of capability development.

6.2.2 Context, Resource Substitution, and Survivable Experimentation

Context matters because the same educational or technological input can lead to different outcomes. A student who completes an entrepreneurship program may be able to test an idea immediately through a family business, an incubator, or a supportive platform network. Another may have similar knowledge but no finance, mentor, legal pathway, or acceptable margin for failure. The framework treats these differences as conditions of activation, not as unexplained background variation.

Resources can also substitute for one another. Family and community support may provide finance, legitimacy, knowledge, or emotional security when formal institutions are weak. The same support can become restrictive if it discourages experimentation or ties the entrepreneur to family expectations. Digital tools may substitute for some marketing or analytical resources, but not for trust, judgment, or institutional permission. The relevant question is which constraint is relaxed and which new dependency is created.

Survivable experimentation refers to conditions under which young people can test entrepreneurial ideas without facing irreversible economic or social loss. This concept connects education, ecosystem support, and technology. Low-cost trials, staged finance, mentoring, protected learning environments, and accountable

FALL 2026

use of AI can improve the informational value of experimentation. Where failure is catastrophic or tool outputs are accepted without scrutiny, experimentation is less likely to produce learning.

6.2.3 Outcomes and Feedback

The framework treats outcomes as trajectories rather than a single event. Venture initiation is one outcome, but persistence, informed exit, adaptation, learning, and economic, social, or environmental value also matter. This broader view is necessary because an immediate start-up count may reward premature entry and ignore the quality of subsequent decisions.

Action also changes the system. Entrepreneurial experience can alter self-efficacy, perceived feasibility, identity, and future intention. It can deepen practical capability through customer interaction, digital practice, network participation, and failure. These feedback effects explain why a one-time intervention may fade and why entrepreneurial development cannot be represented adequately as a one-directional sequence from intention to behavior.

6.2.4 Contribution and Empirical Status

The framework's central empirical proposition is that capability development does not lead uniformly to entrepreneurial action. Its effect depends on activation conditions, including access to resources, institutional legitimacy, and the affordances and dependencies created by digital technologies. The framework also treats intention as endogenous to learning and experience, implying that entrepreneurial action may alter later motivation, perceived feasibility, and capability. These relationships can be examined through longitudinal and multi-level research rather than assumed to represent established causal effects. The framework does not require all elements to be equally strong or to operate identically across contexts.

6.3 Future Research Directions

The next stage of youth entrepreneurship research should move beyond adding further predictors to cross-sectional intention models. The more important task is to observe how intention, capability, and entrepreneurial behavior develop in relation to one another over time. This requires closer attention to the events that change entrepreneurial trajectories, the mechanisms through which education and digital practice affect capability, and the conditions that allow young people to use what they have learned. Research should also examine how these processes differ across young people with unequal access to finance, networks, institutional support, and digital infrastructure.

6.3.1 Intention Revision and Entrepreneurial Trajectories

Entrepreneurial intention is usually measured at a single point, even though it may change substantially during education, employment, business start-up, or failure. A central longitudinal question is when entrepreneurial intentions strengthen, weaken, or change direction after young people encounter market feedback, employment opportunities, venture failure, or changing family circumstances. The Theory of Planned Behavior remains useful for organizing attitudes, perceived control, and social norms, but these constructs should be examined alongside identity development, resilience, experience, and the calibration of entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Geldhof et al., 2014a, 2014b; Gorgievski & Stephan, 2016; Shaw & Sørensen, 2022).

The relevant question is not simply whether intention increases. Research should examine whether a change reflects greater confidence, more accurate judgment, a reassessment of feasibility, or a shift toward a different career or entrepreneurial pathway. A decline in intention after exposure to realistic venture conditions may represent learning rather than program failure. Conversely, strong intention may persist even when the resources required for action remain unavailable.

Entrepreneurial motives should also be followed over time. Economic necessity, market opportunity, social purpose, and environmental values may coexist and change as young people encounter new information and constraints. Sustainability-oriented motives may influence which opportunities are considered legitimate, but they should not be assumed to generate sustainable outcomes (Alzate et al., 2024; Celestin & Vanitha, 2018; Fubah et al., 2025; Gomes et al., 2025). Research should therefore connect changes in motivation to subsequent decisions, including delayed entry, venture experimentation, persistence, redirection, and informed exit. This would also clarify when capabilities developed through education or prior experience are actually used (Birch et al., 2017; Fubah et al., 2025; Nabi et al., 2017).

6.3.2 Educational Mechanisms and Durable Capability

Entrepreneurship education research needs to identify which elements of an intervention produce particular forms of learning. Simulations, venture projects, incubation, mentoring, structured feedback, and interaction with external entrepreneurs are often combined within the same program, making it difficult to determine which components influence self-efficacy, opportunity recognition, judgment, identity, or volitional competence (Sholikhah et al., 2025; Taneja et al., 2024; Taruona & Botha, 2026; Wibowo et al., 2023).

Future studies should separate these components where possible and connect them to clearly defined outcomes. Immediate changes in intention or confidence should not be treated as substitutes for retained

knowledge, improved opportunity evaluation, experimentation quality, venture entry, persistence, or informed exit. Follow-up periods must also be long enough to establish whether educational effects persist after students leave the structured environment of a course or program.

6.3.3 Digital Practice, Artificial Intelligence, and Dependence

Research on digital entrepreneurship should distinguish access to technology from the capability to use it effectively. For example, studies could examine how young entrepreneurs coordinate public platforms, private communication channels, and customer relationships; how they respond to algorithmic changes; and how they manage dependence on a small number of digital intermediaries (Bellaaj, 2023; Bernardino & Santos, 2020; Fubah et al., 2025; Hamid et al., 2024). Business-model adaptation and resilience should be measured through observable decisions and changes in practice rather than only through self-reported attitudes (Caputo et al., 2021; Cueto et al., 2022).

The central issue is whether AI expands a young entrepreneur's ability to evaluate opportunities and test assumptions or encourages the delegation of judgments that the user cannot independently assess. AI governance capacity should therefore be measured through digital literacy, verification practices, transparency, safeguards, and accountability rather than through adoption alone (Giuggioli & Pellegrini, 2023; Kusetogullari et al., 2025; Obschonka & Audretsch, 2020). Research should also examine who benefits from AI use and whether unequal access to data, infrastructure, and complementary expertise widens existing differences among young entrepreneurs.

6.4 Policy and Managerial Implications

Youth entrepreneurship policy should not be evaluated mainly by the number of participants who report entrepreneurial intention or register a venture shortly after a program. These measures reveal little about whether participants can evaluate opportunities, adapt to market feedback, or sustain entrepreneurial activity. Staged financing, mentoring, regulatory guidance, network access, and protected learning environments can reduce the cost of testing an idea. Integrated support involving educational institutions, business associations, and public agencies may address a wider range of constraints than isolated training programs (Boris & Parakhina, 2022). Evaluation should therefore follow participants long enough to observe persistence, adaptation, informed exit, and the quality of entrepreneurial decisions.

Youth empowerment research also connects entrepreneurship support with skills development and economic diversification, but training alone does not remove financial, institutional, and market constraints (Omeje et al., 2020; Yusuf, 2017). Program design should identify which constraint an intervention is intended

to relax. Mentoring may improve judgment and network access, for example, while staged finance may make experimentation possible without exposing a young founder to irreversible loss.

Educators, incubators, accelerators, platform operators, and innovation hubs should provide repeated opportunities for feedback and decision practice rather than relying primarily on information sessions or motivational events. Digital platforms and AI should be introduced together with instruction on verification, platform dependence, transparency, privacy, and accountability. Support must also account for unequal access to networks, finance, and digital infrastructure. Targeted mentoring, facilitated network entry, and scaffolded access to digital tools may reduce some of these differences, but their distributional effects need to be observed rather than assumed.

7. CONCLUSION

This review began with a practical inconsistency: many young people express entrepreneurial intention, yet substantially fewer move into sustained entrepreneurial activity. The literature does not support an explanation based on motivation alone. Intentions change as young people acquire information and encounter constraints. Education may develop judgment and execution capability without producing immediate venture entry, while digital technologies may reduce the cost of experimentation without removing the need for resources, institutional support, and accountable decision making. Distinguishing capability formation from capability activation provides a clearer explanation of why apparently similar young people follow different entrepreneurial paths.

The proposed framework is an interpretive synthesis rather than a tested causal model. The review also relies partly on digital entrepreneurship and AI research that was not conducted specifically with youth populations, and much of the underlying evidence remains cross-sectional and self-reported. The next empirical task is to follow young people across education, employment, experimentation, venture entry, and exit and to identify when developed capability can actually be used. Such evidence would clarify when education, ecosystems, and digital technologies improve entrepreneurial decisions and who benefits from those improvements.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, H. M. S., & Ahmed, Y. A. (2021). Constraints of youth entrepreneurs in Ethiopia. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 11(1), 337-346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40497-021-00292-z>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-t](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-t)
- Al-Mamary, Y. H. S., & Alraja, M. M. (2022). Understanding entrepreneurship intention and behavior in the light of TPB model from the digital entrepreneurship perspective. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 2(2), Article 100106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijime.2022.100106>
- Alzate, P., Mejía-Giraldo, J. F., Jurado, I., Hernandez, S., & Novozhenina, A. (2024). Research perspectives on youth social entrepreneurship: Strategies, economy, and innovation. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 13, Article 49. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-024-00410-7>
- Amha, W. (2015). Growth of youth-owned MSEs in Ethiopia: Characteristics, determinants and challenges. *Ethiopian Journal of Economics*, 24(2), 93-128. <https://ethiopianjournalofeconomics.org/index.php/EJE/article/view/160>
- Arunkumar, R., Murugan, P. P., Senthilkumar, M., Chandrakumar, M., Senguttuvan, K., Gangai Selvi, R., & Dhivya, C. (2025). Entrepreneurial behaviour of youth and its influencing factors: A systematic review. *Plant Science Today*, 12(3), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.14719/pst.7234>
- Awotunde, O. M., & van der Westhuizen, T. (2021). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy development: An effective intervention for sustainable student entrepreneurial intentions. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 15(4), 475-495. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJISD.2021.118424>
- Aya, Y., Senaji, T. A., & Njeru, E. (2018). Factors affecting growth of youth-led small and medium enterprises in Kenya: A case study of garment enterprises in central business district, Nairobi County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 5(3), 885-897. <https://doi.org/10.61426/sjbcm.v5i3.855>
- Azoulay, P., Jones, B. F., Kim, J. D., & Miranda, J. (2020). Age and high-growth entrepreneurship. *American Economic Review: Insights*, 2(1), 65-82. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aeri.20180582>
- Bellaaj, M. (2023). Why and how do individual entrepreneurs use digital channels in an emerging market? Determinants of use and channel coordination. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 18(9), 2735-2764. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoem-08-2020-0882>
- Bernardino, S., & Santos, J. F. (2020). Crowdfunding: An exploratory study on knowledge, benefits and barriers perceived by young potential entrepreneurs. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 13(4), Article 81. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm13040081>
- Bignotti, A., & Le Roux, I. (2020). Which types of experience matter? The role of prior startup experiences and work experience in fostering youth entrepreneurial intentions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 26(6), 1181-1198. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijebr-10-2019-0577>

FALL 2026

-
- Bilewicz, E., & Tsimayeu, A. (2021). Intentions and barriers of youth entrepreneurship in Belarus. *European Research Studies Journal*, 24(2), 956-966. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/2317>
- Biney, I. K. (2023). Adult education and entrepreneurship: Getting young adults involved. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 12, Article 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-023-00277-0>
- Birch, C., Lichy, J., Mulholland, G., & Kachour, M. (2017). An enquiry into potential graduate entrepreneurship: Is higher education turning off the pipeline of graduate entrepreneurs? *Journal of Management Development*, 36(6), 743-760. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmd-03-2016-0036>
- Boateng, G. O., Boateng, A. A., & Bampoe, H. S. (2014). Barriers to youthful entrepreneurship in rural areas of Ghana. *Global Journal of Business Research*, 8(3), 109-119. <https://access.portico.org/stable?au=phx4jw3g8ggg>
- Booth, A., Sutton, A., Clowes, M., & Martyn-St James, M. (2022). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review* (3rd ed.). SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781036232009>
- Boris, O., & Parakhina, V. (2022). Youth entrepreneurship support model and youth business associations. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 19, 1649-1660. <https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2022.19.149>
- Brüne, N., & Lutz, E. (2020). The effect of entrepreneurship education in schools on entrepreneurial outcomes: A systematic review. *Management Review Quarterly*, 70(2), 275-305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-019-00168-3>
- Caputo, A., Pizzi, S., Pellegrini, M. M., & Dabić, M. (2021). Digitalization and business models: Where are we going? A science map of the field. *Journal of Business Research*, 123, 489-501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.09.053>
- Celestin, M., & Vanitha, N. (2018). From idea to impact: How young entrepreneurs are changing the game. *International Journal of Advanced Trends in Engineering and Technology*, 3(2), 36-42. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385787224_FROM_IDEA_TO_IMPACT_HOW_YOUNG_ENTREPRENEURS_ARE_CHANGING_THE_GAME_IN_2018
- Ceptureanu, S. I., & Ceptureanu, E. G. (2015). Challenges and barriers of European young entrepreneurs. *Management Research and Practice*, 7(3), 34-58. <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:rom:mrpase:v:7:y:2015:i:3:p:34-58>
- Chae, B. K., & Goh, G. (2020). Digital entrepreneurs in artificial intelligence and data analytics: Who are they? *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(3), Article 56. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6030056>
- Chalmers, D., MacKenzie, N. G., & Carter, S. (2021). AI and entrepreneurship: Implications for venture creation in the fourth industrial revolution. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 45(5), 1028-1053. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258720934581>
- Chang, S. H., Shu, Y., Wang, C. L., Chen, M. Y., & Ho, W. S. (2020). Cyber-entrepreneurship as an innovative orientation: Does positive thinking moderate the relationship between cyber-entrepreneurial self-efficacy

- and cyber-entrepreneurial intentions in non-IT students? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 107, Article 105975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.03.039>
- Chen, W. D., Acs, Z. J., & Terjesen, S. (2024). Adolescent entrepreneurial learning ecosystem and a tech entrepreneurial career—inspiration from the black swan stories. *Small Business Economics*, 62(3), 1157-1176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-023-00786-y>
- Chiloane-Tsoka, G. E., & Botha, A. (2015). Factors influencing urban youth entrepreneurship development in sub-Saharan Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 13(4-1), 230-239. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.14\(3-2\).2016.12](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.14(3-2).2016.12)
- Cueto, L. J., Frisnedi, A. F. D., Collera, R. B., Batac, K. I. T., & Agaton, C. B. (2022). Digital innovations in MSMEs during economic disruptions: Experiences and challenges of young entrepreneurs. *Administrative Sciences*, 12(1), Article 8. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12010008>
- Damon, W., Bronk, K. C., & Porter, T. (2015). Youth entrepreneurship. In R. A. Scott & S. M. Kosslyn (Eds.), *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 1-13). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118900772.etrds0391>
- Del Giudice, M., & Straub, D. (2011). Editor's comments: IT and entrepreneurship: An on-again, off-again love affair or a marriage? *MIS Quarterly*, 35(4), iii-viii. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41409961>
- Do Nguyen, Q., & Nguyen, H. T. (2023). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention: The mediating role of entrepreneurial capacity. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(1), Article 100730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100730>
- Dvouletý, O. (2023). Religion attitudes and youth entrepreneurship performance. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 36(6), 879-897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2023.2182599>
- Dzisi, S. (2014). Youth entrepreneurship: Investigating obstacles to youth enterprise creation and development. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2(7), 1-15. <https://ijecm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/2717.pdf>
- Edelman, L., Manolova, T., Shirokova, G., & Tsukanova, T. (2016). The impact of family support on young entrepreneurs' start-up activities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(4), 428-448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.04.003>
- Elia, G., Margherita, A., & Passiante, G. (2020). Digital entrepreneurship ecosystem: How digital technologies and collective intelligence are reshaping the entrepreneurial process. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 150, Article 119791. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119791>
- Fatoki, O., & Chindoga, L. (2011). An investigation into the obstacles to youth entrepreneurship in South Africa. *International Business Research*, 4(2), 161-169. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v4n2p161>
- Fubah, C. N., Kansheba, J. M., Marobhe, M. I., & Mohammadparast Tabas, A. (2025). Youth entrepreneurship: A systematic literature review of the domain and future research agenda. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 32(2), 496-516. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-07-2024-0346>

-
- Gallego-Arrufat, M. J., Torres-Hernández, N., García-Martínez, I., & Domene-Martos, S. (2023). An educational framework in digital rights and responsibilities for young entrepreneurs. *SAGE Open*, 13(4), Article 21582440231208614. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231208614>
- Games, D., Masli, E. K., Sari, D., Triani, L. A., & Komalasari, S. P. (2026). Generational cohort and technology readiness and acceptance of artificial intelligence among young high-growth entrepreneurs. *Digital Transformation and Society*, 5(1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231208614>
- García-Lillo, F., Seva-Larrosa, P., & Sanchez-García, E. (2023). What is going on in entrepreneurship research? A bibliometric and SNA analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 158, Article 113624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113624>
- García-Rodríguez, F. J., Gutiérrez-Taño, D., & Ruiz-Rosa, I. (2019). Analysis of the potential of entrepreneurship education in young children. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 9(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2017-0064>
- Geldhof, G. J., Johnson, S. K., Weiner, M. B., Hunt, D., & Lerner, R. M. (2016). Youth entrepreneurship: A developmental systems perspective. In A. Furlong (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of youth and young adulthood* (2nd ed., pp. 198-206). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315753058-32>
- Geldhof, G. J., Malin, H., Johnson, S. K., Porter, T., Bronk, K. C., Weiner, M. B., Agans, J. P., Mueller, M. K., Hunt, D., Colby, A., & Lerner, R. M. (2014a). Entrepreneurship in young adults: Initial findings from the young entrepreneurs study. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 35(5), 410-421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2014.07.003>
- Geldhof, G. J., Porter, T., Weiner, M. B., Malin, H., Bronk, K. C., Agans, J. P., Mueller, M., Damon, W., & Lerner, R. M. (2014b). Fostering youth entrepreneurship: Preliminary findings from the young entrepreneurs study. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24(3), 431-446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12086>
- Ghannad, N., & Sörensson, A. (2025). Entrepreneurial education in a pandemic era: Timeframes, demographics, and the nexus between teaching and experiential learning. *Industry and Higher Education*, 39(1), 8-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222241249898>
- Giones, F., & Brem, A. (2017). Digital technology entrepreneurship: A definition and research agenda. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 7(5), 44-51. <https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/1076>
- Giuggioli, G., & Pellegrini, M. M. (2023). Artificial intelligence as an enabler for entrepreneurs: A systematic literature review and an agenda for future research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 29(4), 816-837. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-05-2021-0426>
- Gomes, S., Pinho, M. M., & Lopes, J. M. (2025). What inspires young Europeans to be agents of change through social entrepreneurship? A youth social entrepreneurship model proposal. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 21(5), 737-764. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-02-2024-0017>

-
- Gorgievski, M. J., & Stephan, U. (2016). Advancing the psychology of entrepreneurship: A review of the psychological literature and an introduction. *Applied Psychology*, 65(3), 437-468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12073>
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91-108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- Guiso, L., Pistaferri, L., & Schivardi, F. (2021). Learning entrepreneurship from other entrepreneurs? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 39(1), 135-191. <https://doi.org/10.1086/708445>
- Gulzar, F., & Fayaz, A. (2023). Youth entrepreneurial intentions: An integrated model of individual and contextual factors. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(5), 1279-1303. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2021-2928>
- Gwija, S. A., Chuks, E. E., & Iwu, C. G. (2014). Challenges and prospects of youth entrepreneurship development in a designated community in the Western Cape, South Africa. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 6(1), 10-20. <https://doi.org/10.22610/jeb.v6i1.465>
- Hahn, D., Minola, T., Bosio, G., & Cassia, L. (2020). The impact of entrepreneurship education on university students' entrepreneurial skills: A family embeddedness perspective. *Small Business Economics*, 55(1), 257-282. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00143-y>
- Hamid, R. S., Ukkas, I., Goso, G., Abror, A., Anwar, S. M., & Munir, A. R. (2024). The role of social media in building trust, self-perceived creativity and satisfaction for millennial entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 31(2), 377-394. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-11-2022-0482>
- Herani, R., & Angela, J. (2025). Navigating ChatGPT: Catalyst or challenge for Indonesian youth in digital entrepreneurship? *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 17(3), 602-628. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-05-2024-0181>
- Hincapié, A. (2020). Entrepreneurship over the life cycle: Where are the young entrepreneurs? *International Economic Review*, 61(2), 617-681. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iere.12436>
- Holzmann, P., & Gregori, P. (2023). The promise of digital technologies for sustainable entrepreneurship: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management*, 68, Article 102593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2022.102593>
- Huang, Q., Rehman, A., Zeeshan, M., & Ullah, I. (2022). Exploring the effect of in situ urbanization on youth entrepreneurship in suburban areas with low-medium development in China: A way forward to sustainable entrepreneurship mechanism. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 10, Article 927918. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.927918>
- Hulsink, W., & Koek, D. (2014). The young, the fast and the furious: A study about the triggers and impediments of youth entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 18(2/3), 182-209. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEIM.2014.062876>

-
- Iansiti, M., & Lakhani, K. R. (2020). *Competing in the age of AI: Strategy and leadership when algorithms and networks run the world*. Harvard Business Review Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342215931_Competing_in_the_Age_of_AI_Strategy_and_Leadership_When_Algorithms_and_Networks_Run_the_World
- Iyortsuun, A. S., Goyit, M. G., & Dakung, R. J. (2021). Entrepreneurship education programme, passion and attitude towards self-employment. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 13(1), 64-85. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jeee-11-2019-0170>
- Joshi, M. P., Pandit, D., Tiwari, S. R., & Choudhary, A. (2024). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial communities in India: Does gender really play a role? *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 18(2), 392-414. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jec-10-2022-0145>
- Kakouris, A., & Liargovas, P. (2021). On the about/for/through framework of entrepreneurship education: A critical analysis. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 4(3), 396-421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420916740>
- Karimi, S., Biemans, H. J. A., Lans, T., Aazami, M., & Mulder, M. (2016). Fostering students' competence in identifying business opportunities in entrepreneurship education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 53(2), 215-229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.993419>
- Kaszuba-Perz, A., Polinceusz, M., & Oszust, K. (2025). The impact of AI and ML on entrepreneurship and career development opportunities for young people. *European Research Studies Journal*, 28(4), 693-704. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/ers/journal/vxxviii/2025i4p693-704.html>
- Kollmann, T., Kleine-Stegemann, L., de Cruppe, K., & Then-Bergh, C. (2022). Eras of digital entrepreneurship: Connecting the past, present, and future. *Business and Information Systems Engineering*, 64(1), 15-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-021-00728-6>
- Kraus, S., Breier, M., & Dasí-Rodríguez, S. (2020). The art of crafting a systematic literature review in entrepreneurship research. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 16(3), 1023-1042. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-020-00635-4>
- Kraus, S., Palmer, C., Kailer, N., Kallinger, F. L., & Spitzer, J. (2019). Digital entrepreneurship: A research agenda on new business models for the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 25(2), 353-375. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijeb-06-2018-0425>
- Kuratko, D. F. (2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577-598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2005.00099.x>
- Kusetogullari, A., Kusetogullari, H., Andersson, M., & Gorschek, T. (2025). GenAI in entrepreneurship: A systematic review of generative artificial intelligence in entrepreneurship research: Current issues and future directions [Preprint]. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2505.05523>
- Lai, L. S. L., & To, W. M. (2020). E-entrepreneurial intention among young Chinese adults. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation*, 28(1), 119-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19761597.2020.1713832>

-
- Larsen, E. H., & Kaspersen, K. (2022). Student case development based on entrepreneurial experiences: A guide for entrepreneurship educators. In K. Wigger, L. Aaboen, D. H. Haneberg, S. Jakobsen, & T. Lauvås (Eds.), *Reframing the case method in entrepreneurship education: Cases from the Nordic countries* (pp. 98-109). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800881150.00019>
- Lin, J., Qin, J., Lyons, T., & Sekiguchi, T. (2023). Planning and evaluating youth entrepreneurship education programs in schools: A systematic literature review. *Entrepreneurship Education*, 6(1), 25-44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41959-023-00092-4>
- Madu, I. C., & Okeche, N. E. (2017). Barriers to effective youth entrepreneurship development in Nasarawa State. *Nigerian Journal of Business Education*, 4, 1-12. <https://nigjbed.com.ng/index.php/nigjbed/article/viewFile/108/108>
- Maleki, A., Moghaddam, K., Cloninger, P., & Cullen, J. (2023). A cross-national study of youth entrepreneurship: The effect of family support. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 24(1), 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14657503211054284>
- Mariani, M. M., Hashemi, N., & Wirtz, J. (2023). Artificial intelligence empowered conversational agents: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 161, Article 113838. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113838>
- Martins, J. M., Shahzad, M. F., & Xu, S. (2023). Factors influencing entrepreneurial intention to initiate new ventures: Evidence from university students. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 12, Article 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-023-00333-9>
- Mir, A. A., Hassan, S., & Khan, S. J. (2023). Understanding digital entrepreneurial intentions: A capital theory perspective. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 18(12), 6165-6191. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoem-05-2021-0687>
- Moos, M. N., Lombard, L., Yap, N. G., Yap, T. M., & Fubah, C. N. (2022). Comparing the effectiveness of public and private support to youth entrepreneurs: A qualitative inquiry. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 19(2), 341-377. <https://doi.org/10.35683/jcm21104.170>
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2), 277-299. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0026>
- Nambisan, S. (2017). Digital entrepreneurship: Toward a digital technology perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(6), 1029-1055. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12254>
- Nguyen, P. N. D., & Nguyen, H. H. (2024a). Examining the role of family in shaping digital entrepreneurial intentions in emerging markets. *SAGE Open*, 14(1), Article 21582440241239493. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241239493>
- Nguyen, P. N. D., & Nguyen, H. H. (2024b). Unveiling the link between digital entrepreneurship education and intention among university students in an emerging economy. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 203, Article 123330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123330>

-
- Nungsari, M., Ngu, K., Chin, J. W., & Flanders, S. (2023). The formation of youth entrepreneurial intention in an emerging economy: The interaction between psychological traits and socioeconomic factors. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 15(2), 333-359. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jee-08-2021-0312>
- Nyanga, T. (2013). Challenges faced by young entrepreneurs at Mandava market in Zvishavane, Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 2(2), 113-117. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:17175879>
- Obschonka, M., & Audretsch, D. B. (2020). Artificial intelligence and big data in entrepreneurship: A new era has begun. *Small Business Economics*, 55(3), 529-539. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00202-4>
- Ofose-Appiah, S., Boahen, P. A. N., & Agbenyegah, A. T. (2025). Socio-ecological barriers to youth entrepreneurship in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review of empirical evidence. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 14, Article 32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-025-00484-x>
- Okirigiti, C. A., & Rafey, M. A. (2015). Challenges facing youth entrepreneurs in slums in Kenya: A case of Kisumu Ndogo slums in Eldoret municipality. *European Open Business & Management Journal*, 1(1), 1-10. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:174784452>
- Omeje, A. N., Jidefor, A., & Ugwu, M. O. (2020). Youth empowerment and entrepreneurship in Nigeria: Implication for economic diversification. *SAGE Open*, 10(4), Article 2158244020982996. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020982996>
- Paré, G., Wagner, G., & Prester, J. (2024). How to develop and frame impactful review articles: Key recommendations. *Journal of Decision Systems*, 33(4), 566-582. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12460125.2023.2197701>
- Pasi, B. N., Kannan, S., & Dhamak, P. S. (2025). Empowering youth for sustainable entrepreneurship: An integrated fuzzy TOPSIS-AHP framework for prioritizing skills and development strategies. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jec-06-2025-0172>
- Paul, J., Alhassan, I., Binsaif, N., & Singh, P. (2023). Digital entrepreneurship research: A systematic review. *Journal of Business Research*, 156, Article 113507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113507>
- Pillai, T. R., & Ahamat, A. (2018). Social-cultural capital in youth entrepreneurship ecosystem: Southeast Asia. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 12(2), 232-255. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-08-2017-0063>
- Prastyaningtyas, E. W., Sutrisno, S., Soeprajitno, E. D., Ausat, A. M. A., & Suherlan, S. (2023). Analysing the role of mentors in entrepreneurship education: Effective support and assistance. *Journal on Education*, 5(4), 14571-14577. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v5i4.2511>
- Ratten, V., & Jones, P. (2021). Entrepreneurship and management education: Exploring trends and gaps. *International Journal of Management Education*, 19(1), Article 100431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100431>

-
- Reis, D. A., Fleury, A. L., & Carvalho, M. M. (2021). Consolidating core entrepreneurial competences: Toward a meta-competence framework. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 27(1), 179-204. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-02-2020-0079>
- Ridzwan, R., Muhammad, N. M. N., & Rahman, A. A. A. (2017). Issues and challenges among young entrepreneurs in Malaysia. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(3), 80-84. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-1903028084>
- Rosário, A. T., & Raimundo, R. (2024). Sustainable entrepreneurship education: A systematic bibliometric literature review. *Sustainability*, 16(2), Article 784. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16020784>
- Rummel, S., Akkermans, J., Blokker, R., & Van Gelderen, M. (2021). Shocks and entrepreneurship: A study of career shocks among newly graduated entrepreneurs. *Career Development International*, 26(4), 562-581. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2018-0296>
- Sahut, J. M., Iandoli, L., & Teulon, F. (2021). The age of digital entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 56(3), 1159-1169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00260-8>
- Sambo, W. (2015). Factors influencing the development of youth entrepreneurship: The case of Ethekwini municipality, South Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 13(4-1), 159-167. https://businessperspectives.org/images/pdf/applications/publishing/templates/article/assets/7110/PPM_2015_04cont_Sambo.pdf
- Sambo, W. (2016). Factors affecting youth entrepreneurship development in Kibera district, Kenya. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 14(3-1), 154-161. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.14\(3-1\).2016.02](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.14(3-1).2016.02)
- Satalkina, L., & Steiner, G. (2020). Digital entrepreneurship and its role in innovation systems: A systematic literature review as a basis for future research avenues for sustainable transitions. *Sustainability*, 12(7), Article 2764. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072764>
- Secundo, G., Mele, G., Del Vecchio, P., Elia, G., Margherita, A., & Ndou, V. (2021). Threat or opportunity? A case study of digital-enabled redesign of entrepreneurship education in the COVID-19 emergency. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 166, Article 120565. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120565>
- Secundo, G., Rippa, P., & Cerchione, R. (2020). Digital academic entrepreneurship: A structured literature review and avenue for a research agenda. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 157, Article 120118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120118>
- Shaw, K., & Sørensen, A. (2022). Coming of age: Watching young entrepreneurs become successful. *Labour Economics*, 77, Article 102033. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2021.102033>
- Shirokova, G., Osiyevskyy, O., Bogatyreva, K., Edelman, L. F., & Manolova, T. S. (2022). Moving from intentions to actions in youth entrepreneurship: An institutional perspective. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 12(1), 25-69. <https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2019-0201>

-
- Sholikhah, Z., Suhartanti, P. D., & Nastiti, T. (2025). 'From ripple to wave': How experiential learning induces students' entrepreneurial intention - a moderated mediation model. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 15(5), 1065-1082. <https://doi.org/10.1108/heswbl-01-2025-0005>
- Sim, M. S. C., Galloway, J. E., Ramos, H. M., & Mustafa, M. J. (2023). University's support for entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial intention: The mediating role of entrepreneurial climate. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 15(2), 360-378. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jeee-09-2021-0354>
- Sirait, H., Hendratmoko, Basuki, R. A., Djubair, R. A., Hardipura, G. T., & Endri, E. (2025). Exploring the diffusion of digital technologies in higher education entrepreneurship: The impact of the utilization of AI and TikTok on student entrepreneurial knowledge, experience, and business performance. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(7), Article 285. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15070285>
- Sitaridis, I., & Kitsios, F. (2024). Digital entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 30(2/3), 277-304. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijebr-01-2023-0053>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Sreenivasan, A., & Suresh, M. (2023). Twenty years of entrepreneurship education: A bibliometric analysis. *Entrepreneurship Education*, 6(1), 45-68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41959-023-00089-z>
- Stam, E., & van de Ven, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystem elements. *Small Business Economics*, 56(2), 809-832. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00270-6>
- Steininger, D. M. (2019). Linking information systems and entrepreneurship: A review and agenda for IT-associated and digital entrepreneurship research. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(2), 363-407. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12206>
- Taneja, M., Kiran, R., & Bose, S. C. (2024). Assessing entrepreneurial intentions through experiential learning, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial attitude. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(1), 98-118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2223219>
- Taruona, H., & Botha, M. (2026). Volitional competencies and behavioral dynamics of early-stage youth new venture teams: Crossing the entrepreneurial Rubicon. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 18(7), 71-99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jeee-02-2025-0088>
- Templier, M., & Paré, G. (2015). A framework for guiding and evaluating literature reviews. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 37, 112-137. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1cais.03706>
- Thomas, O. (2023). Entrepreneurship education: Which educational elements influence entrepreneurial intention? *Industry and Higher Education*, 37(3), 328-344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222221121065>
- Titov, S., Trachuk, A., Linder, N., Pathak, R. D., Samson, D., Husain, Z., & Sushil, S. (2023). Digital transformation enablers in high-tech and low-tech companies: A comparative analysis. *Australian Journal of Management*, 48(4), 801-843. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03128962231157102>

-
- Ukil, M. I., & Jenkins, A. (2023). Willing but fearful: Resilience and youth entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 30(1), 78-99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-03-2022-0154>
- Urbano, D., Aparicio, S., & Audretsch, D. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on institutions, entrepreneurship, and economic growth: What has been learned? *Small Business Economics*, 53, 21-49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-018-0038-0>
- Urbano, D., Audretsch, D. B., Aparicio, S., & Noguera, M. (2020). Does entrepreneurial activity matter for economic growth in developing countries? The role of the institutional environment. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 16(3), 1065-1099. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-019-00621-5>
- von Briel, F., Davidsson, P., & Recker, J. (2018). Digital technologies as external enablers of new venture creation in the IT hardware sector. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 42(1), 47-69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258717732779>
- Wang, Y. M., & Chiou, C. C. (2020). Factors influencing the willingness of universities' business management departments to implement online entrepreneurship program and its effectiveness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 975. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00975>
- Wardana, L. W., Handayati, P., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., Patma, T. S., & Suprajan, S. E. (2020). Determinant factors of young people in preparing for entrepreneurship: Lesson from Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 555-565. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no8.555>
- Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii-xxiii. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4132319>
- Wibowo, A., Narmaditya, B. S., Saptono, A., Effendi, M. S., Mukhtar, S., & Mohd Shafai, M. H. (2023). Does digital entrepreneurship education matter for students' digital entrepreneurial intentions? The mediating role of entrepreneurial alertness. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), Article 2221164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2221164>
- Xie, Y., & Wang, S. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence in entrepreneurship education enhances entrepreneurial intention through self-efficacy and university support. *Scientific Reports*, 15, Article 24079. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-09545-3>
- Yeganegi, S., Laplume, A. O., & Dass, P. (2021). The role of information availability: A longitudinal analysis of technology entrepreneurship. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 170, Article 120910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120910>
- Yusuf, A. D. (2017). Youth business empowerment and entrepreneurship skills in Doguwa Local Government Kano State, Nigeria. *KIU Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1), 163-168. <https://www.kampalajournals.ac.ug/ojs/index.php/niujoss/article/view/54>

Zaheer, H., Breyer, Y., & Dumay, J. (2019). Digital entrepreneurship: An interdisciplinary structured literature review and research agenda. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 148, Article 119735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119735>