

Generation Z's Sustainopreneurship Readiness in Indonesian Tourism: Digital Innovation and Barriers

I Gede Gian Saputra¹, Dewa Ayu Nyoman Aridayanti², Dewa Ayu Made Lily Dianasari³,
Ida Bagus Putra Negarayana⁴

¹Faculty of Tourism, Udayana University, Indonesia

^{2,3,4}Bali Tourism Polytechnic, Indonesia

E-mail: igedegiansaputra@unud.ac.id¹, rid@ppb.ac.id², lily.dianasari@ppb.ac.id³,
negarayana@ppb.ac.id⁴

Article History	Abstract
Received: 10 April 2026 Accepted: 01 June 2026 Published: 27 June 2026	<p><i>This study investigates the sustainopreneurship readiness of Indonesia's Generation Z in the tourism sector, integrating the Theory of Planned Behavior, Self-Determination Theory, and the Triple Bottom Line framework. An explanatory mixed-method design was employed with 100 tourism students from two universities in Bali (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.882$). Descriptive statistics, chi-square tests, Spearman rank-order correlations, and thematic analysis were applied to quantitative and open-ended data. Results reveal that 84% of respondents expressed entrepreneurial interest ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.76$), with no statistically significant demographic variation across gender [$\chi^2(1) = 0.784$, $p = .376$], age [$\chi^2(1) = 0.041$, $p = .840$], or education level [$\chi^2(1) = 2.607$, $p = .106$]. Digital technology and sustainability emerged as deeply integrated orientations ($r_s = .528$, $p < .001$). However, capital access constraints (72%), regulatory barriers (57%), and managerial inexperience (65%) create a significant intention-behavior gap. This study advances the sustainopreneurship literature by distinguishing high dispositional readiness from insufficient structural ecosystem readiness among Generation Z in Indonesia.</i></p> <p>Keywords: <i>digital technology; entrepreneurial motivation; generation z; sustainopreneurship; tourism entrepreneurship</i></p>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

INTRODUCTION

The tourism sector plays a pivotal role in the global economy and has seen rapid growth, particularly with the integration of digital technology and sustainability imperatives (Zhang & Szabó, 2024). This shift aligns with the preferences of Generation Z, who exhibit strong digital literacy and environmental commitment (Prensky, 2001; Saiyed et al., 2022). Generation Z is uniquely positioned to leverage digital platforms, social media, e-commerce, and AI-enabled tools, to drive tourism entrepreneurship (Nambisan & Baron, 2020; Solesvik, 2019; Saputra, 2021). As sustainability gains momentum globally, younger generations are increasingly drawn to ventures that prioritize social responsibility and ecological stewardship (Elkington, 1997; Andrade-Valbuena et al., 2022). However, despite their aspiration and digital proficiency, Generation Z faces structural challenges including limited capital access and insufficient managerial experience (Dheer & Lenartowicz, 2018; Tseng & Lim, 2021).

This study examines the sustainopreneurship readiness of Generation Z tourism students in Indonesia within an integrated theoretical framework. The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB; Ajzen, 1991) explains how entrepreneurial intentions emerge from attitudes,

subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000) illuminates the intrinsic motivational drivers, autonomy, competence, and relatedness, underpinning Generation Z's orientation toward sustainability-driven ventures. Elkington's (1997) Triple Bottom Line (TBL) provides the normative evaluative criterion: sustainopreneurship must generate economic, social, and environmental value simultaneously. By integrating these frameworks, the study advances beyond descriptive profiling to explain the intention-behavior gap characterizing Generation Z sustainopreneurship in an emerging economy context.

The novelty of this study lies in its empirical examination of digital-native characteristics, sustainability commitment, and regulatory ecosystem constraints as an integrated analytical problem, providing evidence from Indonesia, where such integrated analysis remains scarce (Lee & Kim, 2020). The study also introduces the distinction between dispositional readiness (high, values-integrated) and structural ecosystem readiness (insufficient), which represents the primary theoretical contribution.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employs an explanatory mixed-method design, sequentially integrating quantitative survey data with qualitative thematic analysis of open-ended responses (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The quantitative phase employed descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, standard deviations), chi-square tests of independence, and Spearman rank-order correlation (ρ) to measure the extent, demographic distribution, and inter-variable associations of sustainopreneurship readiness. The qualitative phase applied thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to open-ended responses to provide interpretive depth and contextual grounding for quantitative findings. This sequential explanatory strategy is appropriate when quantitative results require elaboration through participant-generated narrative (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018), and thematic analysis was selected over content analysis because of its capacity to identify latent as well as manifest patterns in experiential data without imposing a priori coding categories (Phillimore & Goodson, 2004).

Research Context and Sample

Bali, Indonesia was selected as the research context for three theoretically defensible reasons: (1) it is Indonesia's most internationally recognized tourism destination and receives the highest concentration of international visitors; (2) it hosts the country's highest density of tourism-specialized higher education institutions; and (3) it has been the primary site of recent digital tourism transformation initiatives in Indonesia (Saputra, 2021; Saputra & Sanjiwani, 2024). Data were collected in 2024 from 100 tourism students across two institutions: Udayana University and Bali Tourism Polytechnic (Politeknik Pariwisata Bali). These two institutions were selected because they represent the two dominant degree pathways in Balinese tourism higher education, the academic S1 track and the applied D4 track, enabling comparative coverage of both streams.

Participants were selected using purposive sampling, targeting students who had completed at least two semesters of entrepreneurship-related coursework. This criterion was

applied to ensure respondents possessed sufficient contextual knowledge to evaluate sustainopreneurship feasibility meaningfully, rather than responding based on generalized opinion. The resulting sample comprised 55 females (55.0%) and 45 males (45.0%) respondents; 61% were aged 21–23 years; 42% were of Balinese regional origin, and 58% came from other Indonesian regions, ensuring a geographically diverse student body. Fifty-five respondents (55.0%) were in their final academic semesters (Semester 7–8), indicating an advanced cohort with substantial exposure to both academic and practical tourism education. All respondents provided informed consent, and anonymity was guaranteed throughout data collection.

Instrument Development and Validation

A structured online questionnaire was developed in Google Forms, comprising three sections: (1) demographic information (gender, age, education level, semester, and regional origin); (2) 18 closed-ended ordinal items using a 5-point response scale; and (3) two open-ended questions on perceived barriers and support needs, plus one open-ended question on digital business views. The 18 closed-ended items were organized across five dimensions, as detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. Instrument Dimensions, Indicators, and Reliability Statistics

Dimension	Indicators	Items (n)	α
Entrepreneurial Interest	Interest level, perceived capability, venture intention	1	—
Digital Technology Orientation	Tech for efficiency, most impactful tech, AI adoption	3	0.711
Sustainability Commitment	Sustainability importance, Gen Z preferences, eco-plan, influence on decisions	4	0.770
Digital-Sustainability Integration	Digital potential for sustainability, tech-based sustainable tour interest	2	—
Government Support Expectations	Support importance, training interest	2	0.699
Open-ended (Qualitative)	Barriers, support suggestions, digital views	3	—
Full Scale (10 closed items)	All above closed items	10	0.882

Note: α = Cronbach's alpha. '—' indicates a single-item dimension or where alpha is not applicable. Full-scale α computed from 10 ordinal items measured on a 5-point scale.

Content validity was established through expert review by two tourism faculty members with specializations in entrepreneurship and sustainability before instrument deployment. Item wording was revised based on their feedback to ensure alignment between constructs and indicators. The instrument was pilot-tested on 15 students (not included in the main sample), yielding a Cronbach's α of 0.86, indicating good internal consistency (Hair et al., 2019). In the main sample ($n = 100$), the full-scale Cronbach's α was 0.882, confirming strong internal consistency and stability across the pilot and main administrations. All item-total correlations ranged from $r_{it} = .492$ to $.667$ (all $p < .001$), and α if item deleted ranged from 0.864 to 0.879, indicating that no single item unduly inflated or deflated scale reliability. These statistics are

reported in Table 2.

Table 2. Item-Level Reliability Statistics (n = 100)

Item	M	SD	r_{it}	α if deleted
Entrepreneurial Interest	4.30	0.76	0.622	0.871
Technology for Operational Efficiency	4.48	0.59	0.608	0.868
AI Adoption Consideration	4.05	0.69	0.492	0.878
Sustainability Importance in Business Model	4.36	0.63	0.650	0.868
Gen Z Preference for Sustainable Business	3.85	0.70	0.529	0.876
Sustainability Influence on Business Decision	4.05	0.78	0.666	0.865
Digital Technology for Sustainable Promotion	4.52	0.67	0.656	0.866
Interest in Tech-Based Sustainable Tourism	4.28	0.68	0.667	0.864
Government Support Importance	4.37	0.73	0.512	0.879
Training/Mentoring Program Interest	4.11	0.79	0.654	0.868
Full Scale $\alpha = 0.882$ Pilot $\alpha = 0.860$				

Note: r_{it} = corrected item-total Spearman correlation. All $p < .001$. Scale range: 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).

Data Analysis Procedures

Quantitative analysis. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations) were computed for all ordinal variables. Prior to parametric analysis, Shapiro-Wilk normality tests confirmed that all ordinal variables deviated significantly from normal distributions (all $W \leq 0.836$, all $p < .001$), justifying the use of non-parametric statistics throughout. Chi-square tests of independence examined associations between demographic variables (gender, age, education level) and entrepreneurial interest, which was dichotomized as “interested/very interested” versus “neutral/not interested”. A Kruskal-Wallis H test examined differences in entrepreneurial interest across academic semesters. Spearman rank-order correlations (ρ) assessed inter-variable associations. A significance threshold of $\alpha = .05$ was applied throughout. All analyses were conducted in Python using `scipy.stats`.

Qualitative analysis. Open-ended responses (n = 100 per question) were analyzed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-phase thematic analysis framework: (1) familiarization with data, (2) initial code generation, (3) theme searching, (4) theme reviewing, (5) theme definition and naming, and (6) write-up. Two independent coders analyzed the responses; discrepancies were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached. An inductive approach was applied, allowing themes to emerge from the data rather than from pre-existing theoretical categories. Qualitative findings are used in the Discussion section to elaborate and contextualize quantitative results, consistent with the explanatory sequential design.

Ethical Considerations and Limitations

All respondents provided voluntary informed consent before participation and were assured of anonymity. No identifying information was retained in the dataset. The principal limitation of this design is purposive sampling within a single geographic and institutional context, which constrains generalizability to the broader Indonesian Generation Z population. The sample is also restricted to enrolled students, excluding youth who have not pursued

higher education or who have already entered the labour market. These limitations are acknowledged in the Conclusion and inform future research directions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile

The demographic profile (Table 3) shows a balanced gender distribution (55% female, 45% male), a predominantly late-undergraduate cohort (55% in Semester 7–8), and a geographically diverse sample (42% Balinese origin, 58% from outside Bali). This diversity strengthens the representativeness of findings beyond a solely local Balinese perspective.

Table 3. Demographic Profile of Respondents (n = 100)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Female (Perempuan)	55	55.0
	Male (Laki-laki)	45	45.0
Age	21–23 years	61	61.0
	18–20 years	38	38.0
	24–26 years	1	1.0
Education Level	S1 (Bachelor)	60	60.0
	D4 (Applied Bachelor)	40	40.0
Semester	Semester 7–8	55	55.0
	Semester 5–6	27	27.0
	Semester 3–4	18	18.0
Regional Origin	Bali (Denpasar + Bali)	42	42.0
	Outside Bali	58	58.0

Source: Primary data, 2024

Entrepreneurial Interest and Demographic Associations

Eighty-four percent of respondents expressed entrepreneurial interest (M = 4.30, SD = 0.76), with 47% “very interested” and 37% “interested” (Table 4). Chi-square analyses (Table 5) confirmed no statistically significant associations between entrepreneurial interest and gender [$\chi^2(1) = 0.784, p = .376$], age [$\chi^2(1) = 0.041, p = .840$], or education level [$\chi^2(1) = 2.607, p = .106$]. A Kruskal-Wallis test similarly revealed no significant difference across semesters (H = 1.828, p = .401), indicating that entrepreneurial intention is a dispositional rather than academically acquired characteristic.

Table 4. Level of Interest in Tourism Entrepreneurship (n = 100)

Interest Level	n	%
Very Interested (Sangat tertarik)	47	47.0
Interested (Tertarik)	37	37.0
Neutral/Undecided (Ragu-ragu)	15	15.0
Not Interested (Tidak tertarik)	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Primary data, 2024

Table 5. Chi-Square Tests: Demographic Variables and Entrepreneurial Interest

Variable	Entrepreneurial Interest	χ^2	df	p
Gender	Male: 39 interested / 5 neutral	0.784	1	.376
	Female: 44 interested / 11 neutral			
Age Group	18–20 yrs: 31 / 7	0.041	1	.840
	21–23 yrs: 52 / 9			
Education	D4: 37 / 3	2.607	1	.106
	S1: 47 / 13			

Note: Interested = Sangat tertarik + Tertarik; Not/Neutral = Ragu-ragu + Tidak tertarik.

Motivational Factors

Open-ended motivational responses (Table 6) were dominated by autonomy (67 mentions) and personal passion for tourism (56). The aspiration to become a travel influencer or content creator (40 mentions) emerged as the fourth most cited motivation, a finding not previously documented in comparable Indonesian tourism entrepreneurship studies.

Table 6. Motivational Factors (Multiple responses; n = 100)

Motivation	Mentions (n)
Freedom to manage time and career	67
Personal interest in travel/tourism	56
Potential profits from digital business	50
Opportunity to become travel influencer/content creator	40
Creativity in developing tech-based tourism services	32
Contribution to sustainability/eco-friendly tourism	31

Source: Primary data, 2024

Digital Technology Orientation

A combined 76% rated digital tourism as promising or very promising (Table 7). Technology for operational efficiency was rated important or very important by 95% (M = 4.48, SD = 0.59), and 79% expressed interest in AI adoption (M = 4.05, SD = 0.69). Ninety percent recognized high potential for digital platforms in sustainable tourism promotion (M = 4.52, SD = 0.67). These findings are consistent with Saura et al.'s (2020) documentation of Generation Z's interactions within the digital tourism ecosystem, which identified social media and e-commerce platforms as central mediators of Gen Z's engagement with tourism services and entrepreneurial opportunity recognition.

Table 7. Perceptions of Digital Tourism Potential (n = 100)

Perception	n	%
Very promising	31	31.0
Promising	45	45.0
Neutral	22	22.0
Less promising	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Primary data, 2024

Sustainability Commitment

Ninety-two percent rated sustainability as important or very important (M = 4.36, SD = 0.63); 76% reported it as largely or considerably influential on business decisions (M = 4.05, SD = 0.78); 67% agreed that Generation Z consumers prefer sustainable businesses; and 64% had adopted or were planning eco-friendly practices (Table 8).

Table 8. Sustainability Commitment Indicators (n = 100)

Sustainability Indicator	n	%
Sustainability important/very important for business model	92	92.0
Gen Z prefer sustainable businesses (agree/strongly agree)	67	67.0
Sustainability influences business decision (largely/quite largely)	76	76.0
Eco-practices adopted or planned	64	64.0

Source: Primary data, 2024

Perceived Barriers

Structural barriers dominated responses (Table 9): limited capital access (72%), lack of managerial experience (65%), insufficient digital marketing skills (40%), and limited mentorship (35%).

Table 9. Perceived Barriers to Tourism Entrepreneurship (n = 100)

Barrier	% Citing
Limited access to capital	72%
Lack of managerial experience	65%
Insufficient digital marketing skills	40%
Limited mentorship opportunities	35%

Source: Primary data, 2024

Government Support Expectations

Financial assistance and regulatory facilitation were equally cited (both n = 57), followed by entrepreneurship training (56), tourism promotion (37), and infrastructure development (34) (Table 10). The equivalence of financial and regulatory priorities is a novel finding in this literature.

Table 10. Expected Government Support (Multiple responses; n = 100)

Type of Support Expected	Mentions (n)
Financial assistance / subsidies	57
Regulatory facilitation / licensing ease	57
Entrepreneurship training programs	56
Global promotion of local tourism	37
Tourism infrastructure development	34

Source: Primary data, 2024

Spearman Correlation Analysis

All inter-variable correlations were statistically significant (p < .001), ranging from rs =

.350 to $r_s = .528$ (Table 11). The strongest association was between sustainability importance and digital-sustainability potential ($r_s = .528$), confirming deep integration between these two orientations. Entrepreneurial interest correlated significantly with all tested variables ($r_s = .350-.414$).

Table 11. Spearman Rank-Order Correlations Between Key Variables (n = 100)

Variable Pair	rs	p	Sig.
Entrepreneurial Interest – Sustainability Importance	0.387	<.001	***
Entrepreneurial Interest – Digital-Sustainability Potential	0.414	<.001	***
Entrepreneurial Interest – AI Adoption	0.390	<.001	***
Entrepreneurial Interest – Eco-Practice Plan	0.411	<.001	***
Entrepreneurial Interest – Govt Support Importance	0.350	<.001	***
Sustainability Importance – Digital-Sustainability Potential	0.528	<.001	***

Note: *** $p < .001$. r_s = Spearman's ρ .

Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Table 12 presents mean scores for all closed-ended items. All means exceeded 3.85, with digital-sustainability promotion potential ($M = 4.52$) and technology for operational efficiency ($M = 4.48$) receiving the highest scores.

Table 12. Summary of Descriptive Statistics (n = 100)

Variable	M	SD	n
Digital Technology for Sustainable Promotion	4.52	0.67	100
Technology for Operational Efficiency	4.48	0.59	100
Government Support Importance	4.37	0.73	100
Sustainability Importance in Business Model	4.36	0.63	100
Entrepreneurial Interest	4.30	0.76	100
Interest in Tech-Based Sustainable Tourism	4.28	0.68	100
Training/Mentoring Program Interest	4.11	0.79	100
AI Adoption Consideration	4.05	0.69	100
Sustainability Influence on Business Decision	4.05	0.78	100
Gen Z Preference for Sustainable Business	3.85	0.70	100

Note: Scale: 1 = very low/not interested, 5 = very high/very interested.

DISCUSSION

The results demonstrate that Generation Z tourism students in Indonesia possess substantial and demographically consistent entrepreneurial potential. Eighty-four percent expressed entrepreneurial interest ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.76$), and chi-square analyses confirmed no statistically significant association with gender [$\chi^2(1) = 0.784$, $p = .376$], age [$\chi^2(1) = 0.041$, $p = .840$], or education level [$\chi^2(1) = 2.607$, $p = .106$]. The homogeneity of intention across demographic lines aligns with Ajzen's (1991) TPB, which locates the primary determinants of behavioral intention in attitudinal rather than sociodemographic factors. This finding extends Lee and Kim's (2020) cross-national study by suggesting that within tourism-specialized educational contexts, shared disciplinary socialization may function as a stronger equalizing

force than demographic background.

Motivational analysis reinforces SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The primacy of autonomy (67 mentions) and personal passion for tourism (56) confirm that intrinsic motivation dominates, consistent with Roshchupkina et al.'s (2023) cross-national study of Generation Z entrepreneurial motives, which identified autonomy and purpose as universal drivers across emerging economy contexts. Critically, the aspiration to become a travel influencer or content creator (40 mentions) emerged as the fourth most cited motivation, unreported in prior comparable Indonesian studies. This reflects a platform-mediated entrepreneurial identity (Gretzel & Yoo, 2019) in which content production and venture creation are inseparable dimensions of Generation Z's sustainopreneurship identity, extending Prensky's (2001) digital native framework beyond tool-use to identity formation.

The strongest correlation in the dataset, between sustainability importance and digital-sustainability promotion potential ($r_s = .528, p < .001$), signals that these are not parallel but deeply integrated orientations for this cohort. For Generation Z sustainopreneurs, digital capability is not merely a business tool but the primary vehicle through which sustainability values are operationalized. This confirms Nambisan and Baron's (2020) platform-lowering-entry-barriers argument while advancing it: the digital-sustainability nexus is constitutive of the sustainopreneurial identity for this cohort, not merely instrumental to it.

Sustainability commitment was pervasive and structurally embedded within entrepreneurial aspiration. The chi-square analysis revealed a significant association between very high entrepreneurial interest and active eco-practice planning [$\chi^2(1) = 9.593, p = .002$]: 81% of the most highly motivated respondents had eco-practices adopted or planned, versus only 49% of those less highly interested. This directly supports Belz and Binder's (2017) argument that sustainability is values-driven and extends Saiyed et al.'s (2022) proposition by demonstrating that Gen Z's ethical values are active rather than passive, structurally integrated with, rather than peripheral to, entrepreneurial ambition.

Despite strong intention, a pronounced intention-behavior gap constitutes the central analytical contribution. Spearman correlations reveal that entrepreneurial interest is positively and significantly associated with perceived government support importance ($r_s = .350, p < .001$): the more motivated a respondent, the more urgently they perceived ecosystem support as necessary. This aligns with Krueger and Carsrud's (1993) model, in which behavioral enactment is mediated by perceived feasibility. The binding constraints are structural: capital access (72%), regulatory barriers (57%), and managerial inexperience (65%). Qualitative responses reinforce this: "digital tourism businesses require collaboration between government, business actors, and society to overcome challenges" (Respondent 18); "intensive practical training, not only theory" (Respondent 7). Respondents demonstrate sophisticated diagnostic awareness of what they lack, not motivation, but structural enablers.

The regulatory finding is novel and significant. Financial assistance and regulatory facilitation were cited with identical frequency (both $n = 57$) as priority support needs, a finding absent from prior studies that foreground capital as the dominant constraint (Dheer & Lenartowicz, 2018; Tseng & Lim, 2021). One respondent explicitly called for "simplifying the licensing and bureaucracy process, including providing KUR without a business license requirement" (Respondent 18). This grounds the regulatory barrier in a specific, actionable

policy gap not foregrounded in the existing Indonesian tourism entrepreneurship literature.

The absence of significant differences in entrepreneurial interest across academic semesters ($H = 1.828$, $p = .401$) confirms that aspiration reflects a durable dispositional orientation rather than a product of curriculum exposure. This is theoretically important: it locates the locus of intervention in ecosystem development rather than educational content delivery. This study's primary theoretical contribution is the empirical distinction between two analytically separable dimensions: high dispositional readiness (strong, consistent, values-integrated) and insufficient structural ecosystem readiness (financial, regulatory, and mentoring gaps). Prior Indonesian tourism entrepreneurship research has not drawn this distinction explicitly.

Pedagogical and policy implications are differentiated. For educational institutions, respondents emphasized experiential over theoretical learning: "intensive practical training, not only theory" (Respondent 7), "mentoring on how to start a tourism business" (Respondent 8), "networking events with investors, mentors, and industry actors" (Respondent 16). This calls for problem-based, industry-embedded pedagogy integrating digital marketing, sustainable business model design, and regulatory navigation, consistent with Mínguez et al.'s (2021) post-pandemic curriculum recommendations. For policymakers, the equivalence of financial and regulatory constraints points to a dual intervention: accessible micro-financing (including modified KUR schemes) combined with streamlined licensing pathways for youth-led ventures, targeting the structural feasibility constraints that prevent strong intention from becoming actual venture creation.

CONCLUSION

Generation Z in Indonesia demonstrates substantial and demographically consistent sustainopreneurship potential, with high entrepreneurial interest ($M = 4.30$), deep digital orientation, and genuine sustainability commitment that is structurally integrated with entrepreneurial aspiration ($r_s = .528$, $p < .001$). The integration of TPB, SDT, and the Triple Bottom Line provides an explanatory account of this orientation and its barriers. The central theoretical contribution is the empirical distinction between high dispositional readiness and insufficient structural ecosystem readiness: the intention-behavior gap is not motivational but structural, mediated by capital access, regulatory constraints, and experiential deficits.

Regulatory simplification is identified as an equally important but underutilized policy lever alongside financial support. The emergence of travel influencer/content creator identity as a motivation, and the deep digital-sustainability integration, represent novel empirical contributions from the Indonesian emerging economy context. Limitations. The sample is limited to 100 students at two universities in Bali, constraining generalizability. Future research should employ larger multi-regional samples, include non-student youth, apply structural equation modelling to test the integrated theoretical framework, and adopt longitudinal designs to track intention-to-enactment progression. Practical Implications. Tourism curricula should integrate sustainable business model design, digital marketing, and regulatory navigation through experiential, industry-embedded formats. Policymakers should prioritize accessible micro-financing, simplified licensing for youth-led ventures, and public-private incubation hubs.

AI Disclosure

AI-assisted tools were used solely for language refinement. No AI tool generated data, conducted analyses, or formulated conclusions. All authors take full responsibility for the final content.

REFERENCES

- 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)
- Andrade-Valbuena, N., Baier-Fuentes, H., & Gaviria-Marin, M. (2022). An overview of sustainable entrepreneurship in tourism, destination, and hospitality research based on the Web of Science. *Sustainability*, 14(22), 14944. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142214944>
- Belz, F. M., & Binder, J. K. (2017). Sustainable entrepreneurship: A convergent process model. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 26(5), 567–585. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.1887>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Dheer, R. J. S., & Lenartowicz, T. (2018). Entrepreneurship in emerging markets. In G. Cook & J. Johns (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to international management education* (pp. 133–154). Routledge.
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st-century business*. Capstone.
- Gretzel, U., & Yoo, K. H. (2019). Social media and travel information: Generation Z’s approach. *Tourism Review*, 57(2), 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-06-2018-0223>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage.
- Krueger, N. F., & Carsrud, A. L. (1993). Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 5(4), 315–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985629300000020>
- Kumar, S., Kumar, V., Kumari Bhatt, I., Kumar, S., & Attri, K. (2023). Digital transformation in tourism sector: Trends and future perspectives from a bibliometric-content analysis. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jhti-10-2022-0472>
- Lee, S., & Kim, Y. (2020). Factors influencing entrepreneurial intention among Generation Z in Asia. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27(3), 338–357. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-11-2019-0345>
- Mínguez, C., Martínez-Hernández, C., & Yubero, C. (2021). Higher education and the sustainable tourism pedagogy: Are tourism students ready to lead change in the post-pandemic era? *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 29, 100329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2021.100329>
- Nambisan, S., & Baron, R. A. (2020). Digital entrepreneurship: Toward a digital technology perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 44(5), 1041–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719900773>
- Phillimore, J., & Goodson, L. (Eds.). (2004). *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*. Routledge.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816>
- Roshchupkina, V., Khakirov, A., Manuylenko, V., Gryzunova, N., Koniagina, M., & Ermakova, G. (2023). Entrepreneurial activity of Generation Z: Motives, algorithms for starting a business. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(11), e1331. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v11i11.1331>
- Saiyed, M., Srivastava, N., & Gupta, B. (2022). Entrepreneurship and ethics: Perspective of Gen Z. *International Journal of Special Education*, 37(3), 5274–5285. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6140996>
- Saputra, I. G. G. (2021). Bentuk digitalisasi desa wisata di masa normal baru: Studi kasus Desa Sayan Ubud Bali. *Jurnal Kepariwisata*, 20(1), 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.52352/jpar.v20i1.448>
- Saputra, I. G. G., & Sanjiwani, N. M. G. (2024). Digitalization of rural tourism products: Evaluating stages and managerial readiness. *International Journal of Human Research and Social Science Studies*, 1(6), 92–96. <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijhrss/01-2024-Vol0116>
- Saura, J. R., Palos-Sanchez, P., & Cerdan, A. G. (2020). The digital tourism ecosystem: Exploring Generation Z’s interactions. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 17, 100223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100223>
- Solesvik, M. Z. (2019). Entrepreneurial intentions of Generation Z: A cross-national study. *Journal of Global*

- Entrepreneurship Research, 9(2), 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40497-019-00153-y>
- Tseng, C. H., & Lim, M. H. (2021). Barriers and facilitators for Generation Z entrepreneurship in the tourism industry. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 37, 100771. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100771>
- Zhang, Y., & Szabó, Z. (2024). Digital transformation in the tourism industry: A comparative literature review. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences*, 72(1), 166–179. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/72/20240667>