

Article

Digital Approach to Successful Business Plans in Forestry and Related Fields

Eva Abramuszkinová Pavlíková ^{1,*} , Jitka Meňházová ¹  and Kristaps Lešinskis ² ¹ Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology, Mendel University in Brno, 613 00 Brno, Czech Republic² Department of Management, BA School of Business and Finance, LV-1013 Riga, Latvia* Correspondence: eva.pavlikova@mendelu.cz

Abstract: This paper introduces the KABADA (Knowledge Alliance of Business Idea Assessment: Digital Approach) tool, together with the opinions of young people about entrepreneurship, their skills, and their experience with this tool. The focus is on non-business students who study natural sciences, engineering, and other areas at the Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology at Mendel University in Brno, Czech Republic. The KABADA tool has been developed and tested by a team of international experts. It can be used by a wide audience, including forester management specialists. This structured, web-based platform is based on theoretical research, relevant statistics, and artificial intelligence insights. It guides entrepreneurs through business idea assessment including challenges and opportunities. The research included survey answers from 60 university students before and after using the KABADA tool. The results show that students are interested in entrepreneurship but do not have the knowledge or experience, or support from the curriculum. The majority of the students had no or very low experience with entrepreneurship, no entrepreneurship training, and had not studied entrepreneurship. After using the tool, students declared that they had a higher knowledge of entrepreneurship and the number of students who intended to become an entrepreneur increased. The tool is available online, free of charge.

Keywords: business plan; artificial intelligence; forester management; young entrepreneurs



Citation: Pavlíková, E.A.; Meňházová, J.; Lešinskis, K. Digital Approach to Successful Business Plans in Forestry and Related Fields. *Forests* **2023**, *14*, 513. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f14030513>

Academic Editors: Stelian Alexandru Borz and Nopparat Kaakkurivaara

Received: 17 January 2023
Revised: 27 February 2023
Accepted: 4 March 2023
Published: 6 March 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The beginning of the 21st century is facing many social, economic, and environmental challenges in Europe and worldwide. It is also a digital age, which brings opportunities to learn effectively with the use of digital technologies and artificial intelligence [1–3].

1.1. Entrepreneurship and Self Employment

Entrepreneurship is introduced in various ways including the economic, psychological, sociological, or legal aspects. The economic concept stresses the fact that entrepreneurship is a dynamic process creating added value. The psychological concept is focused on achieving self-fulfillment, cutting loose, becoming independent, etc. The sociological concept introduces entrepreneurship as creating prosperity for all those interested in looking for ways to better use resources, and creating jobs and opportunities, while the legal concept is grounded in effective legislation [4]. Becoming an entrepreneur offers young people the opportunity to deepen their human capital attributes, such as self-reliance or skill development, and to increase their level of happiness. Among societal benefits, we can name job creation, increasing innovation, raising competition, and responding to changing economic opportunities and trends. There are latent entrepreneurs among young people. Two-in-five young people in the EU would like to set up their own business, as suggested by Euro Flash barometer data. For this reason, youth entrepreneurship is attractive to policymakers. Youth entrepreneurship in the EU (self-employment) rates are low relative to the adult population and males and ‘older’ young people are more likely to be in entrepreneurship [5].

To start a business and continue activities, people should be motivated. According to Jirovská [6], people start doing business as a result of two causes—either due to negative events and dissatisfaction at work, risk of unemployment, or no opportunity for personal growth (so-called push theory) or because of attractive opportunities available in the market (so-called pull theory). Authors Williams, Round, and Rodgers [7] are critical of this classification of entrepreneurs as those “forced” to do business and those who use market opportunities. People usually decide to do business based on a combination of push and pull factors, and the incentives of entrepreneurs change over time.

Staniewski and Awruk [8] identified the main factors motivating people to start a business as, personal self-fulfillment and self-satisfaction, the possibility of higher earnings, and independence in decision-making. They identified the main factors preventing people from starting a business as, lack of experience and capital and the risk of failure.

Youth entrepreneurship is often introduced in the context of youth unemployment, which has many undesirable economic, social, and political consequences for societies and individuals, including reduced earnings and social exclusion. In 2011, one-in-five young people in the EU were unemployed. The level of youth unemployment was very high in several EU member states, with rates of over 50% recorded in Spain and Greece in 2013. Naturally, the creation of employment opportunities, sustainable growth, promotion of youth entrepreneurship, and making Europe more entrepreneur-friendly has become a priority on the EU policy agenda [9]. With the economic and financial crisis after 2008, youth unemployment has reached ‘alarming levels’ in some EU member states [10].

In general, more men tend to be self-employed than women, and the proportion between men and women in business is 1.9 [11,12]. In the case of the Czech Republic, 2.6 times more men than women do business and there is a significant dominance of university graduates [13]. However, the number of active female entrepreneurs has been growing continually in the Czech Republic, unlike the number of active male entrepreneurs, which has been stable since 2011. There is also a long-term trend in the Czech Republic, with a growing number of self-employed people who do business as a secondary activity. The number of people whose business is their core activity is decreasing [14].

1.2. Sustainable Business

New digital technologies are becoming widespread and have radically redefined business processes and practices. Simultaneously, numerous companies are implementing sustainable business models, expecting to integrate sustainability considerations and increase competitive advantage. These two megatrends, digitalization and sustainability, are radically changing firms [15]. While some theoretical studies mention using digitalization to enhance sustainability [16–18], they remain too fragmented and broad.

Sustainable and effective management of agriculture and forestry is essential to preserve and protect the landscape, keep the rural economy alive, combat depopulation, and, consequently, combat development disparities. Economic background is an important basis for the decision-making of managers or all interested entities but also for the competitiveness of the sector. The importance of responsible business reflects the core values of society. Responsible business is essential for large and small businesses, which can improve their economic, environmental, and social performance in the short and long term through innovative products and services, new skills, and stakeholder engagement. This involves a commitment by a company to conduct its economic activities in an efficient, socially, and environmentally responsible manner, taking into account the interests of all stakeholders. Enterprises must fulfil also a number of other functions, particularly those related to the social and environmental aspects of a business. Sustainability research is continuously expanding, as evidenced by studies such as those by Teece [19], Wichaisri and Sopadang [20], and Zemigala [21].

Because of climate change, the agriculture and forestry sectors will face a number of challenges in the future, which should be tackled by sustainable innovations. Businesses face increasing pressure from their environment to act in a socially responsible manner

and the importance of environmental protection has an impact on all activities of the enterprise [22]. A business that does not focus only on short-term profit but also considers the principles of long-term sustainability can be called a sustainable business, based on the principles of sustainable development [23]. According to Vrabcova et al. [24], the fundamental starting point is environmental friendliness, both locally and globally. With dwindling supplies of natural resources, the demand for sustainable products and consumption is growing exponentially. Orecchini et al., Ahi and Searcy, Hajek and Kubová agree that sustainability is becoming a fundamental principle for businesses [25–27]. As stated by Hummels and Argyrou [28], a sustainable business can make a significant contribution to improving environmental sustainability while operating a profitable business. Salmivaara and Kibler [29] add that current generations support entrepreneurial activities that are assumed to contribute to sustainable development, ignoring the fact that entrepreneurship potentially brings negative externalities.

Patzelt and Shepherd [30] define sustainable entrepreneurship as discovering, creating, and exploiting opportunities to create products that sustain the natural environment and provide development opportunities for other stakeholders. Kuckertz and Wagner [31] and Vrabcova and Urbanova [32] add that sustainable entrepreneurship is related to the triple bottom line. Sustainable business models [33] are primarily tools to ensure the social and environmental sustainability of systems. The ability to quickly and successfully transform business models into sustainable and competitive ones is a key factor in improving the performance of organizations and supply chains [26,34]. Organizations should demonstrate to customers that high-quality products are produced and do not harm the environment or endanger the health of their employees [35]. However, as Geissdoerfer et al. [34] report, many business model innovations fail, and the reasons for these failures are hardly explored [23].

Sustainable business models are defined by Schaltegger et al. [36] as the creation of customer and social value through the interaction of social, environmental, and business activities. To this definition, Geissdoerfer et al. [37], Geissdoerfer et al. [34], and Nosratabadi et al. [23] add additional stakeholders who help to create, deliver, capture, and exchange sustainable value. These definitions introduce sustainable business models as modifications of conventional business models with added characteristics, namely incorporating sustainability-focused concepts, principles, or goals or integrating sustainability into value propositions or mechanisms [34]. Examples of innovations and sustainable business models include sustainable start-ups [38,39], transformation to a sustainable business model [23], or social enterprises [40]. Cooney [41] bases sustainable business sustainability principles incorporated into all management activities including environmentally friendly products. Sustainable business is a pathway to competitiveness with respect to environmental principles in operations. As Baumgartner [42] adds, if sustainability aspects are not part of the mindset of an organization's managers, they will not be effective and are very likely to fail.

There is no comprehensive picture of how businesses in different sectors can implement sustainability into their business models [23], however, authors Todeschini, Cortimiglia, Callegaro-de-Menezes, and Ghezzi [38] have addressed specific trends that can be drivers of sustainability and related to business model innovation. These include in particular the circular economy [23], corporate social responsibility [43–46], the sharing economy [47], technological innovation [48], and lean manufacturing [20]. Developing sustainable business model innovations in agriculture and forestry is important [49], as the sector is inherently linked to respect for nature and its resources.

As stated above, sustainable business is based on the principles of sustainable development, which requires simultaneous and balanced progress in social, economic, and environmental areas [26]. The basic assumptions of the social pillar include the eradication of poverty [50,51], both within and between regions and in global settings between countries and geopolitical entities [52]. The economic pillar, according to Baumgartner and Rauter [53], consists of all economic activities, the interactions between them, and the interactions between the environment and society. In the environmental area, some

important factors can be mentioned [54], such as the amount and type of waste in the organization, the consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources, water and energy consumption, hazardous chemicals and their handling, greenhouse gas emissions, ecological footprint, carbon footprint, biodiversity protection, etc.

1.3. Theoretical Assumptions Leading to the Model Creation

Digital platforms are unifying the digital tools and applications that governments and businesses use to communicate, manage, transfer knowledge, network, and collaborate. Depending on the functions performed, the following types of digital platforms can be distinguished: instrumental (designed to create software solutions), infrastructure (designed to simplify stakeholder interaction processes), and applied (implementing a specific business model). Improvement of the sustainability and efficiency of forestry supply chains requires a seamless flow of information to support integrated planning of supply chain activities, thereby facilitating the seamless exchange of data between supply chain actors and encouraging new forms of collaboration [55].

There are web-based tools that can be helpful for the preparation of business plans. In general, a business plan provides a detailed roadmap that shows the future of a business. Business plan software is specifically designed to guide users through the steps of a business plan and fill in any gaps. In this way users can be more confident in clarifying the business direction, raising funds, developing team members, and ultimately achieving business goals. For a business owner, it is essential to consider whether new software or tools will benefit the business or unnecessarily increase costs. General business plan software applications offer several advantages, including step-by-step guidance to help to make the right decisions for a business. This takes the guesswork out of aligning the business structure and cash flow forecast with future goals. Many small business owners do not have a strong financial background or understanding of the strategic aspects of a business plan. Most software applications provide financial tools to lay out the case for a successful venture (expenses, cash flow, revenue, financial projections) [56].

Business plan builder software creates reports, charts, and documents based on the information provided. The generated statements and reports can save a significant amount of time. Well-designed business plan creation software often includes guarantees of accountability and accuracy for all reports, which can be customized. They also provide an opportunity to try out multiple scenarios depending on long-term business goals and thereby providing more confidence in the proposed business. Many tools include templates to choose from and gear them toward specific types of businesses.

However, business plan creation software can also have a few drawbacks, such as a lack of flexibility. Some business plan software applications only allow for specific customizations. This includes sticking to the available templates the software provides, and not being able to rewrite the script or edit certain data points. There can be also a lack of industry knowledge or inconsistencies between the selected industry and the software. This can lead to missing information on vital industry knowledge and practical experience [56]. Some of these tools can be expensive, ranging from basic plans to premium versions. The most popular applications are, for example: Bizplan, BizPlanBuilder, Cuttles, Business Plan Pro, Business Sorter, etc. [56].

In the digital age, skills needed for successful entrepreneurship can be obtained by using automated software with machine learning and artificial intelligence. Digital technologies are increasingly becoming a valuable source of future competitiveness for various organizations [57–59]. As they are widely used in business and everyday life, we propose to also use them in education [2]. Digital technologies used in the forestry industry consist of software products and applications that facilitate the operation of the “smart production” system, work with large amounts of data, technical devices (drones, etc.), and developed robotic systems. Innovative strategies applied in forestry are more and more associated with the introduction of digital technologies into production activities [55]. Guang et al. [60] support a focused vision of the techniques and technology of Digital

Forestry, which can provide a view of the path ahead, and the ability to rapidly move forward to new levels of integrated forestry.

Most of the digital technologies in forestry are related to the counting of harvested timber, technological processing of timber, etc. The digitalization of economic data is slow and still needs to be processed. Digitalization is transforming the forest industry, providing unprecedented solutions that make forests more intelligent [61]. The need to digitalize processes from the business side is assessed as high [62]. However, it needs to be converted into a form that will serve forest users, timber buyers, and logging machine operators, or for forest planning purposes. Therefore, the forest industry is constantly improving systems that make the most of data and make better decisions [63].

According to Wing et al. [64], digital measurement tools for forestry applications are now becoming affordable for many organizations. One example is a digital range finder that can almost instantly record distance, height, and angular measurements of objects within the line of sight of an observer. Digital forestry remains largely a concept to be developed. Forestry scientists and practitioners are now beginning to grapple with this new challenge. The application of the digital forestry concept could add value to existing programs in natural resources education by providing students with a better understanding of the integrated use of technology to support sustainable forestry. We should recognize the importance of maintaining a highly skilled community of “digital foresters” who can accomplish tasks using the most appropriate data and technologies to support on-the-ground operations. The role of digital technologies in promoting sustainable business and efficiency in forestry supply chains is known, namely in the field of precision forestry. The scope of the research is mostly focused on digital technologies that have been developed over recent years to support the management of forest-based supply chains.

We consider the lack of digital tools in forester education as a research gap. The aim of this paper is to introduce the KABADA tool (Knowledge Alliance of Business Idea Assessment: Digital Approach) as a unique tool that can be used also in forester education, as declared by opinions of young people about entrepreneurship. Our focus is primarily on students with little in the way of a business background, who study natural sciences, engineering, and other core areas at the Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology at Mendel University in Brno, Czech Republic. KABADA was developed by a team of international experts and has been already tested at several higher education institutions. It is a tool that can be used for better forestry management and we propose to use it in the education of students or forestry-related professionals.

2. Materials and Methods

In most cases, entrepreneurship education research tries to analyze the experience of business students or students having a high entrepreneurial intention. Research [65] shows that entrepreneurship education can have an important positive effect on students with low initial entrepreneurial intent. Therefore, it is valuable and recommended to consider non-business students as a sample group [66]. This has served as the reason for this study to examine and analyze the effects of using the KABADA digital tool on entrepreneurial intention in Generation Z, compared to traditional training methods, in a sample of non-business students in the Czech Republic. The sample consists of young people, who were born between 1995 and 2012, which is considered to be Generation Z. [67].

The KABADA tool has undeniable advantages in several aspects. Working with the tool is relatively simple and easy to understand, and unlike some other tools, it is available for free. KABADA is a structured, web-based platform that aims to take the guesswork out of business plan development. Informed by theoretical research, relevant statistics, and artificial intelligence (AI) insights, the tool guides new entrepreneurs through every step of the way, helping them understand where they stand, where and how they might consider proceeding, and what challenges and opportunities lie ahead [1].

A quasi-experiment was performed in this study. An essential feature of experimental research is that the researchers deliberately control and manipulate the conditions that

determine the outcome of interest by performing an intervention and measuring the effects it produces. An experiment involves changing one variable, called the independent variable (causal factor), and observing the effect of that change on another variable, called the dependent variable. Using a fixed design, experimental research can be confirmatory, seeking an answer to confirm or reject a hypothesis, or exploratory, revealing the effects of certain variables [68]. An independent variable is an input variable, while a dependent variable is an outcome variable or result [69]. In the case of this experiment, the independent variable is the educational seminar using the KABADA tool and the dependent variable is the entrepreneurial intention.

As part of a quasi-experiment, the research investigates whether the use of a digital tool in the educational process has a positive effect on the entrepreneurial intention of Generation Z youth in the sample of Czech students, but especially whether its use has a stronger influence on the entrepreneurial intention than when only the traditional method with a presentation of the topic and discussion with the audience is used. Thus, within the framework of the experiment, there was also a control group that learned the same entrepreneurship education issues but without using the KABADA digital tool.

In each session, its participants were surveyed both before and after the session, including in the second questionnaire some of the same questions as before the session, but also additional questions. The same questions were repeated in order to assess changes in responses after the training session, which is one of the most important tasks of this study. The sessions were of two types—with and without the use of the KABADA tool. This paper is focused on the results of one training session where the KABADA tool was used.

From autumn 2022, the KABADA tool has been tested by potential users. We have conducted a research study that consisted of survey number 1 given before using the KABADA tool. Students filled in a survey online and later listed to a seminar where the KABADA tool was introduced. They accessed the KABADA platform, followed the steps of a user, and tried to make their own business plan. After this experience, they were asked to fill in survey number 2. The aim of the pre- and post-activity surveys was to find out what the self-assessment of students related to entrepreneurship is and how this changes after the KABADA experience.

Our respondents were students from Mendel University in Brno, Czech Republic. The sample of students consisted of 60 respondents before using the KABADA tool, specifically 41 students from the Czech Republic, 1 student each from Slovakia, Germany, China, Zambia, Italy, Latvia, 2 students each from Zimbabwe, Ghana, Israel, 3 students from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and 4 from Spain. As for gender, 26 students were female and 34 were male. Most students were from the 18–21 years age group (32 students), followed by 18 students aged 22–25 and 10 students aged 26 or older. Most students (51) were undergraduates (Bachelors level) and nine were Masters students. The fields of studies were the following: business management, administration or related field (2 students), Life sciences (1 student), education (1 student), engineering (25 students), economics, finance (6 students), natural sciences, mathematics, information technologies (25 students).

The survey consisted of 34 questions. Survey 1 focused on the following topics: (1) self-assessment of the knowledge of entrepreneurship (scale 1–7), (2) intention to become an entrepreneur (scale 1–7), (3) experience in entrepreneurship (4 options), (4) dis/agreement with 11 statements about entrepreneurship such as: “. . . is about taking risks, innovation, career path . . . ” (scale 1–7), (5) feelings about being an entrepreneur him/her self (scale 1–7), (6) fulfillment of life by doing business (scale 1–7), (7) interest in business (scale 1–7), (8) statements about entrepreneurial capacity (scale 1–7), (9) dis/agreement with statements about the meaning of entrepreneurship for society, etc. (scale 1–7), (10) influence factors (family, friends, . . . , scale 1–7). Survey 2 included questions and statements: (11) influence of the tool in relation to an interest in entrepreneurship (scale 1–7), (12) feedback to Canvas (scale 1–7), (13) learning experience and interest in business (scale 1–7), (14) feedback on lecturer (16 statements, scale 1–7), (15–18) feedback on group in class, time, on-line form (scale 1–7), (19) feedback on specific parts of tool (scale 1–7), (20) evaluation of the workshop

and tool (quality of class, relation to practice, scale 1–7), (21) level of difficulty of the tool (scale 1–7), (22–25) open questions (what was un-/important, very good, improvements), (26) evaluation of the class (scale 1–3), (27–34) identification questions (country, age, gender, level and field of studies, entrepreneurs in close family and among friends, experience with entrepreneurship training).

Online Survey 1 was sent to students' emails at the beginning of the KABADA seminar. Students were sitting in a classroom and filled in the survey in 20 min. The online KABADA seminar took place for about 2 h. After this, Survey 2 was sent to students' emails to fill in feedback in 30 min. Results were analyzed.

3. Results

3.1. Digital Approach–KABADA Tool

The KABADA tool was developed in 2019–2022 in cooperation with these institutions: BA School of Business and Finance (Riga, Latvia, Coordinator), Vilniaus kolegija/University of Applied Sciences (Vilnius, Lithuania), Mendel University in Brno (Brno, Czech Republic) Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal (Setúbal, Portugal), ArtSmart (Riga, Latvia), Youth Entrepreneurship Promotion Association (Lithuania), Centro Studi "Cultura Sviluppo" (Italy), JSC "Development Finance Institution Altum" (Riga, Latvia) and SWH SETS Ltd. (Riga, Latvia). The authors of the current paper are project team members [1].

The KABADA tool can be used as a guide to widen audience interest in entrepreneurship through important steps [1]. The primary target audience is entrepreneurs, students, university lecturers, business consultants, development finance institutions, and related individuals. It is important to note that the tool is suitable not only for existing and future professionals in the field of business and management but also for professionals in any field, including forestry, where business projects are planned and whose representatives also start new business initiatives. During the development process of the tool, its structure was created based on classic business plan development principles and content. When working with the tool, the business project planner sequentially goes through six large blocks—industry statistics, industry risks, creating a Business Model Canvas, SWOT analysis, personal characteristics analysis, and financial projections [70].

The first two blocks in the structure of the KABADA tool inform the user about the statistical trends in the selected industry in the country where the user plans to do business, comparing them also with the trends in that industry throughout the European Union. The source of statistical data is Eurostat, the statistical office of the European Union. In addition, the user is introduced to the risks at the macro, industry, and company levels, which are typical for companies in the selected industry. The macro level of risk analysis is based on the PESTE (political, economic, social, technological, environmental factors) analysis. Industry-level risks are analyzed using Michael Porter's Five Forces Framework, which was first published in the Harvard Business Review in 1979 [71]. The development of a business model within the framework of the KABADA tool takes place using the Business Model Canvas. It consists of the nine "building blocks" of the business model design template that came to be called the Business Model Canvas and was initially proposed in 2005 by Swiss business theorist Alexander Osterwalder [72]. In the next block of the tool, the user performs a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis for the purpose of creating a generic strategy. In both mentioned blocks, the user has to sequentially make choices from a set of options predefined by the system. Since it is important for a potential entrepreneur to be aware of his/her readiness to start a business, the system has another block in which the user completes a test, assessing his/her entrepreneurial abilities, knowledge, and external circumstances that can either help or hinder the conduct of business. Financial projections are the final block of the KABADA tool. It is connected to the Business Model Canvas previously developed by the user. Thus, when filling out the financial projections section, the user must enter numbers against various types of assets, liabilities, revenue streams, cost items, and initial investment. After completing this task, the system generates a cash flow statement for the first period of operations [73].

Artificial intelligence algorithms are also built into the KABADA tool, which provide for gradual learning of the system from the business plans created in the system. As a result, the user, while working in the tool, receives artificial intelligence advice in various places when choices have to be made [74,75].

The KABADA tool includes significant work with big data. This is due to a huge amount of data from external resources, such as the Eurostat Structural Business Statistics database, and also internal resources of the system, such as business plans created in the system. The volume of Eurostat Business Statistics data is immense, and the KABADA system must be able to extract from it exactly the necessary information within the relevant industry and country, as well as create combined images with various indicators so that the user can easily perceive the trends in the industry's development using different absolute and relative indicators. In addition, the system is gradually filled with a large number of business plans, which contain extensive information about business models and financial projections, which the system must be able to process and offer easy-to-understand recommendations to the users. The KABADA tool is available online [1]: <https://kabada.eu/> (accessed on 15 November 2022).

3.2. Self-Assessment of Entrepreneurship by Students

The KABADA tool has been introduced to university students to ask them for self-assessment of entrepreneurship knowledge and skills before (Survey 1) and after (Survey 2) using the tool. Based on the results from Survey 1 and 2, the majority of students (85%) had no entrepreneurship training and had not studied entrepreneurship before. Students decided on a scale from 1 (very poor knowledge) to 7 (excellent knowledge) about their knowledge of entrepreneurship. Before using the KABADA tool, from 60 respondents, 10 students declared that their knowledge of entrepreneurship was average. Better-than-average knowledge or skills was mentioned by 8 students, including 2 with excellent knowledge. The other 42 students reported a lower-than-average level of knowledge, including 15 students who self-assessed their poor knowledge. We can conclude that the majority of our sample of 60 students had poor knowledge of entrepreneurship. After introducing the KABADA tool, 18 students declared that their knowledge of entrepreneurship was average, and 19 reported that it was better than average. The entrepreneurship awareness of the students increased from 30% to 64% after having experienced the KABADA tool.

From our sample, 13 students have an average intention to become an entrepreneur and 23 have an even higher intention. It is quite surprising in relation to the previous question, where only 18 students had some kind of knowledge about entrepreneurship but 36 have the intention to be active entrepreneurs. Twenty-four students had lower intentions than average to become entrepreneurs. After the KABADA experience, the number of students who intended to become an entrepreneur increased from 60% to 78%.

In general, 63% of students had no prior experience in entrepreneurship, 25% of them had a little experience, 10% had some kind of experience and 2% were very experienced. The majority of students had no or very low experience with entrepreneurship.

The reply to the statement "Entrepreneurship could fulfill your life", was positive in the case of 44 (of 60) students, with from average to strong agreement, before using the KABADA tool and 46 (of 58) students after using the KABADA tool. About 73% of our sample could imagine that entrepreneurship could fulfill their life. After the KABADA experience, this rose to 79%.

About 75% of students agreed, with from average to strong agreement, with the statement "Entrepreneurship interests me". The majority of students expressed interest in entrepreneurship. After using the KABADA tool, this rose to 76%.

With the statement "Starting a business would be easy for me" only 28% of students agreed positively, the rest disagreed. For the majority, it would not be easy to start a business. After using the KABADA tool, the proportion giving a positive response increased to 35%. Here we can see the positive influence of the KABADA tool.

Survey 1 showed that the majority of students (87%) do not understand how to plan a business, similarly, 73% do not understand risks and their management and 83% do not know how to develop products, plan resources, and engage needed partners. Survey 2, after using the KABADA tool, showed that the majority of students (69%) still do not understand how to plan a business, similarly, 72% still do not understand risks and their management and 85% still do not know how to develop products, plan resources, and engage needed partners. We can see the positive influence of the KABADA tool on an understanding of business planning, risk, and management. We assume, that for developing products, planning resources, and engaging partners, they would need more time to develop the knowledge and skills.

Students were also asked to comment on the statement: "If I start my own entrepreneurship, I would have a high probability of succeeding". The majority (85%) do not agree with this statement. After the KABADA experience, this fell to 83%. It is quite surprising that 47% of students are neutral or considering starting or participating in a business within the next 5 years (which was more or less the same after the KABADA experience). This contains also a neutral attitude, agreement, and strong agreement. The importance of business skills for society is expressed by 75% of students who consider entrepreneurship to be a socially significant activity (more or less the same after the KABADA experience), including also a neutral attitude, agreement, and strong agreement.

4. Discussion

The KABADA digital tool is a relatively simple and user-friendly tool for creating a business plan. Detailed use of the tool was tested with non-business students in courses related to entrepreneurship and basic business economics. The work with this tool can be explained very roughly and briefly in about 3 h; however, for a deeper understanding of the functioning of the tool and especially for obtaining a quality output, i.e., a well-prepared business plan, longer work with the tool is needed and preparation is also necessary.

The first step to working with the KABADA tool is the preparation of documents and information that will be subsequently entered into the tool. It is definitely necessary to have a good understanding of the business sector and try to get information about the industry. Other information that the user should know before using the tool is information about potential customers, competitors, and at least estimated financial possibilities for starting the business. It is also prudent to think that all the resources are available to the potential entrepreneur, namely material, human, and financial resources. After this information is available, it is possible to start working with the tool. The time frame for creating a business plan is very individual. It depends on the amount and quality of data as well as on the complexity of the offered product or service. A very simple plan can be developed in a few hours, but more complex ones can take longer. Of course, the tool saves the plan as it is progressed and therefore it is possible for the user to continue with their work at any time. The outputs obtained from the KABADA tool include SWOT analysis, risk analysis, financial projections of cash flow, etc. The clear and comprehensive output, as well as the possibility to download the plan in several formats, can be evaluated very positively.

Based on the definitions given in the theoretical background, it can be summarized that sustainable development is a complex set of principles that allow the use of economic tools and technologies to meet the needs of people while fully respecting environmental limits and adapting the perceptions of individuals, organizations, and their processes. Responsible business is a concept in which companies voluntarily integrate social and environmental considerations into their business operations and stakeholder relations. It is therefore about the overall relationship of a company with all its stakeholders—customers, owner-investors, employees, public authorities, suppliers, competitors, communities, etc. It involves the commitment of the enterprise to develop its economic activities in an efficient and responsible manner toward society and the environment, taking into account the interests of all stakeholders. Each stakeholder influences the competitiveness of the company in its own way. Key approaches to promoting the concept of sustainable development

and factors for competitiveness include an emphasis on a process approach, non-financial performance of the company, and stability of the sector.

Private forest owners and forest entrepreneurs play an important role in all forms of forest ownership and management regimes, both in Europe and worldwide. The process of creating an entrepreneurial environment (i.e., starting a forestry business) is an important element of the entrepreneurial framework in any activity, and in the forestry sector, it is also a prerequisite for sustainable forest management. As might be expected, with a few exceptions [76], it is the business-oriented and timber-producing forest owners who are more likely to manage and harvest their stands. Groups of forest owners whose primary objective is not production but rather recreation (for themselves and family) are unlikely to engage in entrepreneurial activities [77].

Forest owners who are classified as indifferent or uninterested in entrepreneurial activities can take advantage of the new opportunities offered by the KABADA tool. In the case of their lack of involvement in their own forests, it seems unlikely that they will be able to engage directly in entrepreneurial activities, but for others, there may be opportunities to use their forests for entrepreneurial activities.

If a broader definition of innovation as novelty for the firm and its owner is used, the innovation activity of small firms whose owners are addressing many new ways would be incomparably higher. The importance of development opportunities, innovations, and sustainability has been already stressed by Patzelt and Shepherd [30]. A few firms could be identified as based on some innovative technological development, but an important advantage was often compatibility with existing production/processing facilities [78]. Services have also been found to play a key role in developing and supporting business model innovation and improving existing products and processes [79]. Innovation has been shown to be more related to the scale of operations than ownership structure, which is inevitably due to the huge differences in the size of forest enterprises and all the associated issues of access to technology, knowledge, and markets [80].

According to the available country studies, it seems that entrepreneurship has often not even been a primary topic of interest or emphasis in forestry policy, although it is of great importance in societies in general [81]. One important influencing factor is certainly the common European labor market and the free movement of labor, as a promising opportunity for expanding the activities of entrepreneurs [82].

Capturing value for societal actors, other than the enterprise itself and the environment, involved creating a competitive advantage and additional revenue for key partners. These include, for example, promoting job creation, improving quality of life and consumption choices for users and customers, and reducing social and environmental impacts during production and in the overall product/service life cycle [78]. However, other studies also suggest the need for innovation (e.g., improved circularity and logistics) and challenging the traditional culture of forestry [83–86].

Attention in the forestry sector should be paid also to improving the infrastructure to support ICT. In this regard, it is recommended to conduct, for example, expert surveys of forestry enterprise representatives on the state and level of technical readiness of digital technologies in the field of forest exploitation, protection, conservation, and reproduction or afforestation. It would also be useful to draw up methodological recommendations for interviewing participants in forestry to assess the use of information and communication technologies in forestry.

Economic data on the behavior of each company is important for the managers to plan and manage the company's operations. As a result, it is possible to analyze ongoing processes, correct the company's behavior and predict the outcome of a given activity. The development of new technologies brings an acceleration in information collection and processing. The original non-digital medium of information is changing to an electronic one depending on the type, size, and equipment of the company. In doing so, we are limited by the availability of services and the lack of service providers in the field of mobile data transmission. It is already quite common for basic operational data to be produced

directly by operational staff (or sent automatically from the means used) and for this data to be processed and sorted automatically. Managers can obtain data in real-time for further analysis. This corporate information is regarded as the know-how of each company and therefore problematic to share with other market participants. Discussing and sharing economic data in some form can be seen as a challenge that should be attempted.

For many forest owners, entrepreneurship is not a problem because they are primarily interested in forest management for personal or environmental reasons. In general, however, the issue of forest entrepreneurship certainly deserves further study. A possibility would be to link future studies to cultural differences and institutional characteristics of small-scale forestry, which usually strongly influence the level of forestry entrepreneurship. Our results confirm the statement of Salmivaara and Kibler [29] that students consider entrepreneurship to be a socially significant activity and they are aware of the importance of business skills. This also corresponds to the statement of Orecchini et al., Ahi and Searcy, Hajek and Kubová, and Hummels and Argyrou that sustainability is a fundamental principle for business [25–28]. Although the majority of students from our sample had no entrepreneurship training, had not studied entrepreneurship before, and had no or little experience of business, almost half of them were either neutral toward or considering starting or participating in a business within the next 5 years.

The respondents of this contribution were students with non-business backgrounds, but they do have general intentions to become entrepreneurs. After the KABADA experience, the number of students who intended to become an entrepreneur increased from 60% to 78%. About 73% of our sample could imagine that entrepreneurship could fulfill their life before their KABADA experience; after it, this rose to 79%. The majority of the students expressed interest in entrepreneurship. After using KABADA, 76% of students declared from average to strong agreement with the statement “Entrepreneurship interests me”. Their knowledge of entrepreneurship was initially poor but after introducing the KABADA tool, it increased. Using this tool would help students to start a business, as they expressed in their answers. We can see the positive influence of the KABADA tool on their understanding of entrepreneurship planning and risk and management.

5. Conclusions

The KABADA tool was developed with theoretical knowledge, relevant statistics, and artificial intelligence insights. This tool can be used by anybody interested in entrepreneurship and we believe it is very suitable for people developing business skills related to forestry management. KABADA users go through six large blocks—industry statistics, industry risks, business model canvas, SWOT analysis, personal characteristics analysis, and financial projections. Artificial intelligence algorithms are built into the KABADA tool, which provides for gradual learning of the system from the business plans created in the system. The user receives artificial intelligence advice in various places when choices have to be made. The KABADA tool includes significant work with big data, such as the Eurostat Structural Business Statistics database and business plans created in the system.

Our research showed the interest of students in developing good quality business plans. We have realized that this issue goes beyond EU borders and it would be valuable to present a similar opportunity for businesses outside the EU. Of course, there are limitations in the Eurostat Statistics, and we are aware that this can be considered a limitation to our research. An important issue is also the time that is needed to fill in the KABADA tool. The more time students have, including some basic knowledge, the more detailed the KABADA business plan evaluation provided. Our respondents were university students and possible future entrepreneurs. We would recommend for future research to offer the KABADA tool to respondents working in various organizations developing new products or experienced businessmen. Moreover, we would suggest exploring other databases available as data sources for specific industries.

This contribution showed that non-business students are very interested in entrepreneurship but do not have the knowledge, experience, and support from the curriculum. After

using the KABADA tool, students declared that they had a higher knowledge of entrepreneurship and the number of students who intended to become an entrepreneur increased. We believe that the KABADA tool can be used by a wide audience and in the case of the forestry sector, it might increase interest in the usage of digital tools and entrepreneurship awareness.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, E.A.P. and J.M.; methodology, E.A.P. and K.L.; software, K.L.; validation, E.A.P.; formal analysis, E.A.P. and J.M.; investigation, E.A.P. and K.L.; resources, E.A.P. and J.M.; data curation, K.L. and J.M.; writing—original draft preparation, E.A.P.; writing—review and editing, E.A.P. and J.M.; project administration, E.A.P.; funding acquisition, E.A.P. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the Erasmus+ KA2 Knowledge Alliances program, project KABADA/Knowledge Alliance of Business Idea Assessment: Digital Approach, project number: 612542-EPP-1-2019-1-LV-EPPKA2-KA. The research was supported by the Department of Engineering, Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology, Mendel University in Brno, Czech Republic.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. KABADA Consortium. Start off Your Business on the Right Foot. 2022. Available online: <http://kabada.ba.lv/#/> (accessed on 8 December 2022).
2. Mavlutova, I.; Lesinskis, K.; Liogys, M.; Hermanis, J. Innovative teaching techniques for entrepreneurship education in the era of digitalization. *WSEAS Trans. Environ. Dev.* **2020**, *16*, 725–733. [CrossRef]
3. Lesinskis, K.; Mavlutova, I.; Peiseniece, L.; Hermanis, J.; Pokatayeva, O. Modern Business Teaching: The Sable Labor Market Provision for the Emerging Generations. *Stud. Appl. Econ.* **2021**, *39*, 1–7. [CrossRef]
4. Veber, J.; Srpová, J. *Podnikání Malé a Střední Firmy*; Grada: Praha, Czech Republic, 2012.
5. Green, F. Youth Entrepreneurship. OECD. 2013. Available online: https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/youth_bp_finalt.pdf (accessed on 10 November 2022).
6. Jirovská, E. *Analýza Pozitivních a Negativních Faktorů Působících na Zakladatelskou Aktivitu v ČR a Jejich Krajské Odlišnosti*; KUFŘ: Praha, Czech Republic, 2003.
7. Williams, C.; Round, J.; Rodgers, P. Evaluating the motives of informal entrepreneurs: Some lessons from Ukraine. *J. Dev. Entrep.* **2009**, *14*, 59–71. [CrossRef]
8. Staniewski, M.; Awruk, K. Motivating Factors and Barriers in the Commencement of One's Own Business for Potential Entrepreneurs. *Ekon. Istraz. Econ. Res.* **2015**, *28*, 583–592.
9. Mascherini, M.; Bisello, M.; IKEI Research & Consultancy. Youth Entrepreneurship in Europe: Values, Attitudes, Policies, Eurofound. 2015. Available online: <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1841442/youth-entrepreneurship-in-europe/2584928/> (accessed on 2 January 2023).
10. Tosun, J.; Mierina, I.; Shore, J.; Atci, M.; Hörisch, F. Youth Entrepreneurship in Europe. 2016. Available online: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jale-Tosun/publication/292286462_Youth_Entrepreneurship_in_Europe/links/56ac894d08ae28588c5f36e9/Youth-Entrepreneurship-in-Europe.pdf (accessed on 20 October 2022).
11. Cañizares, S.M.S.; García, F.J.F. Gender differences in entrepreneurial attitudes. *Equal. Divers. Incl. Int. J.* **2010**, *29*, 766–786. [CrossRef]
12. Koellinger, P.; Minniti, M.; Schade, C. Gender Differences in Entrepreneurial Propensity. *Oxf. Bull. Econ. Stat.* **2011**, *75*, 213–234. [CrossRef]
13. Lukeš, M.; Jakl, M.; Zouhar, J. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2013. Podnikatelská Aktivita v České Republice. Global Entrepreneurship Research Association. 2014. Praha. Available online: <https://www.mpo.cz/assets/dokumenty/50478/57277/612398/priloha001.pdf> (accessed on 19 October 2022).
14. AMSP ČR. Analýza AMSP ČR. *Srovnávací Analýza Podnikatelů a Podnikatelek*. 2016. Available online: <http://www.amspace.cz/zeny-valcuji-muze-v-poctunove-zalozenychzivnosti?highlightWords=srovn%C3%A1vac%C3%AD+anal%C3%BDza+podnikatel%C5%AF+podnikatelek> (accessed on 10 September 2022).
15. Broccardo, L.; Zicari, A.; Jabeen, F.; Bhatti, Z.A. How digitalization supports a sustainable business model: A literature review. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **2023**, *187*, 122146. [CrossRef]
16. Xu, R.Z.; Zhang, L.; Zhao, H.W.; Peng, Y. Design of Network Media's Digital Rights Management Scheme Based on Blockchain Technology. In Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE 13th International Symposium on Autonomous Decentralized Systems (Isads 2017), Bangkok, Thailand, 22–24 March 2017; pp. 128–133. [CrossRef]
17. Song, Zhengyi, and Young Moon. Assessing sustainability benefits of cybermanufacturing systems. *Int. J. Adv. Manuf. Technol.* **2017**, *90*, 1365–1382. [CrossRef]

18. Wu, Y.; Schuster, M.; Chen, Z.; Le, Q.V.; Norouzi, M.; Macherey, W.; Krikun, M.; Cao, Y.; Gao, Q.; Macherey, K.; et al. Google's neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *arXiv* **2016**, arXiv:1609.08144.
19. Teece, D.J. Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strat. Manag. J.* **2007**, *28*, 1319–1350. [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Wichaisri, S.; Sopadang, A. Trends and Future Directions in Sustainable Development. *Sustain. Dev.* **2017**, *26*, 1813–1826. [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Zemigala, M. Tendencies in research on sustainable development in management sciences. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *218*, 796–809. [[CrossRef](#)]
22. Bučiūniene, I.; Kazlauskaitė, R. *The linkage between HRM, CSR and performance outcomes*. *Baltic Journal of Management*; Emerald Group Publishing Limited: Oxford, UK, 2012; Volume 7, pp. 5–24. ISSN 1746-5265.
23. Nosratabadi, S.; Mosavi, A.; Shamshirband, S.; Kazimieras Zavadskas, E.; Rakotonirainy, A.; Chau, K.W. Sustainable Business Models: A Review. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 1663. [[CrossRef](#)]
24. Vrabcová, P.; Smolová, H.; Urbancová, H.; Fajčíková, A. *Strategie Bioekonomiky pro Udržitelnou Evropu a Iniciativa BioEast. Prameny a Studie*; National Agricultural Museum: Prague, Czech Republic, 2019; Volume 64, pp. 17–28.
25. Orecchini, F.; Valitutti, V.; Vitali, G. Industry and academia for a transition towards sustainability: Advancing sustainability science through university–business collaborations. *Sustain. Sci.* **2012**, *7*, 57–73. [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Ahi, P.; Searcy, C. A comparative literature analysis of definitions for green and sustainable supply chain management. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2013**, *52*, 329–341. [[CrossRef](#)]
27. Hájek, M.; Kubová, P. Identification of Basic Trends in Public Expenditures of Environmental Protection in the Czech Republic. In *Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Public Finance 2016*; University of Economics: Prague, Czechia, 2016; pp. 146–155.
28. Hummels, H.; Argyrou, A. Planetary demands: Redefining sustainable development and sustainable entrepreneurship. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2020**, *278*, 123804. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Salmivaara, V.; Kibler, E. “Rhetoric Mix” of Argumentations: How Policy Rhetoric Conveys Meaning of Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Development. *Entrep. Theory Pract.* **2019**, *44*, 700–732. [[CrossRef](#)]
30. Patzelt, H.; Shepherd, D.A. Recognizing Opportunities for Sustainable Development. *Entrep. Theory Pract.* **2011**, *35*, 631–652. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. Kuckertz, A.; Wagner, M. The influence of sustainability orientation on entrepreneurial intentions—Investigating the role of business experience. *J. Bus. Ventur.* **2010**, *25*, 524–539. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Vrabcová, P.; Urbancová, H. The Approach of Czech Business Entities to the Promotion and Application of the Corporate Social Responsibility. *Hradecké Ekon. Dny* **2021**, *11*, 870–888. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Lüdeke-Freund, F. Towards a conceptual framework of business models for sustainability. In *Proceedings of the Knowledge Collaboration & Learning for Sustainable Innovation—Conference Proceedings, 14th European Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption And Production (ERSCP) & 6th Environmental Management for Sustainable Universities (EMSU)*, Delft, The Netherlands, 25–29 October 2010; pp. 25–29.
34. Geissdoerfer, M.; Vladimirova, D.; Evans, S. Sustainable business model innovation: A review. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *198*, 401–416. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Veleva, V.; Ellenbecker, M. Indicators of sustainable production: Framework and methodology. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2001**, *9*, 519–549. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Schaltegger, S.; Lüdeke-Freund, F.; Hansen, E.G. Business cases for sustainability: The role of business model innovation for corporate sustainability. *Int. J. Innov. Sustain. Dev.* **2012**, *6*, 95. [[CrossRef](#)]
37. Geissdoerfer, M.; Bocken, N.M.P.; Hultink, E.J. Design thinking to enhance the sustainable business modelling process—A workshop based on a value mapping process. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2016**, *135*, 1218–1232. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Todeschini, B.V.; Cortimiglia, M.N.; Callegaro-De-Menezes, D.; Ghezzi, A. Innovative and sustainable business models in the fashion industry: Entrepreneurial drivers, opportunities, and challenges. *Bus. Horiz.* **2017**, *60*, 759–770. [[CrossRef](#)]
39. Smolová, H.; Kubová, P.; Urbancová, H. Success Factors for Start-ups Related to Agriculture, Food and Nutrition and Their Relevance to Education. *Acta Univ. Agric. Et Silv. Mendel. Brun.* **2018**, *66*, 791–801. [[CrossRef](#)]
40. Powell, M.; Osborne, S.P. Can marketing contribute to sustainable social enterprise? *Soc. Enterp. J.* **2015**, *11*, 24–46. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Cooney, S. *Build a Green Small Business: Profitable Ways to Become an Ecopreneur*; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 2009.
42. Baumgartner, R.J. Organizational culture and leadership: Preconditions for the development of a sustainable corporation. *Sustain. Dev.* **2009**, *17*, 102–113. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Ciccullo, F.; Pero, M.; Caridi, M.; Gosling, J.; Purvis, L. Integrating the environmental and social sustainability pillars into the lean and agile supply chain management paradigms: A literature review and future research directions. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *172*, 2336–2350. [[CrossRef](#)]
44. Klarin, T. The Concept of Sustainable Development: From its Beginning to the Contemporary Issues. *Zagreb Int. Rev. Econ. Bus.* **2018**, *21*, 67–94. [[CrossRef](#)]
45. Fortunati, S.; Morea, D.; Mosconi, E.M. Circular economy and corporate social responsibility in the agricultural system: Cases study of the Italian agri-food industry. *Agric. Econ.* **2020**, *66*, 489–498. [[CrossRef](#)]
46. Vrabcová, P.; Urbancová, H. Approaches of selected organisations in the Czech Republic to promoting the concept of sustainable development and corporate social responsibility. *Agric. Econ.* **2021**, *67*, 255–265. [[CrossRef](#)]

47. Leung, X.Y.; Xue, L.; Wen, H. Framing the sharing economy: Toward a sustainable ecosystem. *Tour. Manag.* **2018**, *71*, 44–53. [CrossRef]
48. Coccia, M. Measuring the impact of sustainable technological innovation. *Int. J. Technol. Intell. Plan.* **2009**, *5*, 276. [CrossRef]
49. Franceschelli, M.V.; Santoro, G.; Candelo, E. Business model innovation for sustainability: A food start-up case study. *Br. Food J.* **2018**, *120*, 2483–2494. [CrossRef]
50. Sengupta, M. Transformational Change or Tenuous Wish List? A Critique of SDG 1 ('End Poverty in All Its Forms Everywhere'). *Soc. Altern.* **2018**, *37*, 12–17.
51. Kang, K.; Wang, M.; Luan, X. Decision-making and coordination with government subsidies and fairness concerns in the poverty alleviation supply chain. *Comput. Ind. Eng.* **2020**, *152*, 107058. [CrossRef]
52. Cobbinah, P.B.; Erdiaw-Kwasie, M.O.; Amoateng, P. Rethinking sustainable development within the framework of poverty and urbanisation in developing countries. *Environ. Dev.* **2015**, *13*, 18–32. [CrossRef]
53. Baumgartner, R.J.; Rauter, R. Strategic perspectives of corporate sustainability management to develop a sustainable organization. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2017**, *140*, 81–92. [CrossRef]
54. Sengupta, S.; Sahay, A. Comparing mission statements of social enterprises and corporate enterprises in the new and renewable energy sector of India: A computer aided content analysis study. *J. Glob. Entrep. Res.* **2017**, *7*, 21. [CrossRef]
55. Bespalova, V.V.; A Polyanskaya, O.; A Lipinskaya, A.; Gryazkin, A.V.; A Kazi, I. Digital technologies in forestry. *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.* **2021**, *806*, 012008. [CrossRef]
56. Best Business Plan Softwares. Available online: <https://www.mageplaza.com/blog/best-business-plan-software-and-tools.html> (accessed on 15 January 2022).
57. Coreynen, W.; Matthyssens, P.; Van Bockhaven, W. Boosting servitization through digitization: Pathways and dynamic resource configurations for manufacturers. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* **2017**, *60*, 42–53. [CrossRef]
58. Kamalaldin, A.; Linde, L.; Sjödin, D.; Parida, V. Transforming provider-customer relationships in digital servitization: A relational view on digitalization. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* **2020**, *89*, 306–325. [CrossRef]
59. Kohtamäki, M.; Parida, V.; Oghazi, P.; Gebauer, H.; Baines, T. Digital servitization business models in ecosystems: A theory of the firm. *J. Bus. Res.* **2019**, *104*, 380–392. [CrossRef]
60. Zhao, G.; Shao, G.; Reynolds, K.M.; Wimberly, M.C.; Warner, T.; Moser, J.W.; Rennolls, K.; Magnussen, S.; Köhl, M.; Anderson, H.-E.; et al. Digital Forestry: A White Paper. *J. For.* **2005**, *103*, 47–50. [CrossRef]
61. Morkovina, S.; Nasriddinov, S.; Shanin, I. Forestry digital platform of Russia. *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.* **2020**, *595*, 012042. [CrossRef]
62. Arvidsson, V.; Mønsted, T. Generating innovation potential: How digital entrepreneurs conceal, sequence, anchor, and propagate new technology. *J. Strat. Inf. Syst.* **2018**, *27*, 369–383. [CrossRef]
63. Elia, G.; Margherita, A.; Passiante, G. Digital entrepreneurship ecosystem: How digital technologies and collective intelligence are reshaping the entrepreneurial process. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **2019**, *150*, 119791. [CrossRef]
64. Wing, M.; Solmie, D.; Kellogg, L. Comparing Digital Range Finders for Forestry Applications. *J. For.* **2004**, *102*, 16–20. [CrossRef]
65. Lorz, M. The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education on Entrepreneurial Intention. Doctoral Dissertation, University of St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland, 2011.
66. Zhang, Y.; Duysters, G.; Cloudt, M. The role of entrepreneurship education as a predictor of university students' entrepreneurial intention. *Int. Entrep. Manag. J.* **2013**, *10*, 623–641. [CrossRef]
67. Twenge, J.M. *iGen: Why Today's Super-Connected Kids Are Growing Up Less Rebellious, More Tolerant, Less Happy—and Completely Unprepared for Adulthood—and What That Means for the Rest of Us*; Atria Books: New York, NY, USA, 2017; ISBN-10:9781501151989.
68. Cohen, M.; Manion, L.; Morrison, K. *Research Methods in Education*, 8th ed; Routledge: Oxfordshire, UK, 2017; ISBN 9781315456515.
69. Kgaile, A.; Morrison, K. Measuring and Targeting Internal Conditions for School Effectiveness in the Free State of South Africa. *Educ. Manag. Adm. Leadersh.* **2006**, *34*, 47–68. [CrossRef]
70. Carvalho, L.; Mavlutova, I.; Lesinskas, K.; Dias, R. Entrepreneurial perceptions of students regarding business professional career: The study on gender differences in Latvia. *Econ. Sociol.* **2021**, *14*, 220–241. [CrossRef]
71. Porter, M.E. How Competitive Forces Shape Strategy. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **1989**, *57*, 133–143. [CrossRef]
72. Osterwalder, A. What Is a Business Model? 2005. Available online: <https://www.strategyzer.com> (accessed on 10 October 2022).
73. Lesinskas, K.; Carvalho, L.; Mavlutova, I.; Dias, R. Comparative Analysis of Students' Entrepreneurial Intentions in Latvia and Other CEE Countries. *WSEAS Trans. Bus. Econ.* **2022**, *19*, 1633–1642. [CrossRef]
74. Mavlutova, I.; Lesinskas, K.; Liogys, M.; Hermanis, J. *The Role of Innovative Methods in Teaching Entrepreneurship in Higher Education: Multidisciplinary Approach, chapter, In Reliability and Statistics in Transportation and Communication*; Kabashkin, I., Jatskiv, I., Prentkovskis, O., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2020; pp. 684–693. [CrossRef]
75. Kravalis, I.; Ciekurs, K.; Ropa, A.; Mavlutova, I.; Hermanis, J. Teaching Methods for Generation Z for Physical Activities: A Stable Labor Market Provision under the COVID-19 Pandemic. *WSEAS Trans. Bus. Econ.* **2021**, *18*, 1432–1451. [CrossRef]
76. Kuuluvainen, J.; Karppinen, H.; Ovaskainen, V. Landowner objectives and nonindustrial private timber supply. *For. Sci.* **1996**, *42*, 300–309.
77. Dhuháin, N.; Cobanova, R.; Karppinen, H.; Mizaraite, D.; Ritter, E.; Slee, B.; Wall, S. The Values and Objectives of Private Forest Owners and Their Influence on Forestry Behaviour: The Implications for Entrepreneurship. *Small-Scale For.* **2007**, *6*, 347–357. [CrossRef]

78. D'Amato, D.; Veijonaho, S.; Toppinen, A. Towards sustainability? Forest-based circular bioeconomy business models in Finnish SMEs. *For. Policy Econ.* **2018**, *110*, 101848. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Pelli, P.; Haapala, A.; Pykäläinen, J. Services in the forest-based bioeconomy—Analysis of European strategies. *Scand. J. For. Res.* **2017**, *32*, 559–567. [[CrossRef](#)]
80. Šálka, J.; Longauer, R.; Lacko, M. The effects of property transformation on forestry entrepreneurship and innovation in the context of Slovakia. *For. Policy Econ.* **2005**, *8*, 716–724. [[CrossRef](#)]
81. Niskanen, A.; Lunnan, A.; Ota, I.; Blatner, K.; Herbohn, J.; Bull, L.; Ferguson, I.; Hickey, G.M. Policies Affecting Forestry Entrepreneurship. *Small-Scale For.* **2007**, *6*, 233–255. [[CrossRef](#)]
82. Porčić, M.; Landekić, M.; Papa, I.; Lepoglavec, K.; Nevečerel, H.; Seletković, A.; Bakarić, M. Current status and perspectives of forestry entrepreneurship in Croatia. *South-East Eur. For. Seefor* **2017**, *8*, 21–29. [[CrossRef](#)]
83. Hansen, E. Responding to the bioeconomy: Business model innovation in the forest sector. In *Environmental Impacts of Traditional and Innovative Forest-Based Bioproducts*; Springer: Singapore, 2016; pp. 227–248.
84. Manninen, K.; Koskela, S.; Antikainen, R.; Bocken, N.; Dahlbo, H.; Aminoff, A. Do circular economy business models capture intended environmental value propositions? *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *171*, 413–422. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Reim, W.; Sjödin, D.; Parida, V.; Rova, U.; Christakopoulos, P. Bio-economy based business models for the forest sector. A systematic literature review. In *International Scientific Conference Rural Development*; Aleksandras Stulginskis University: Akademija, Lithuania, 2017; pp. 775–780.
86. Korhonen, J.; Hurmekoski, E.; Hansen, E.; Toppinen, A. Firm-level competitiveness in the forest industries: Review and research implications in the context of bioeconomy strategies. *Can. J. For. Res.* **2018**, *48*, 141–152. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.