INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ENTREPRENEURIAL VENTURES: NAVIGATING AUTOMATION'S IMPACT ON COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE IN SMEs

[1]MARKO KOLAKOVIĆ, PH.D., [2]LIA HEWITT, PH.D., [3]LODEWIKUS JANSE VAN RENSBURG, PH.D.

Faculty of Economics & Business, University of Zagreb, Croatia;College of Business and Economics, University of Johannesburg, South Africa; College of Business and Economics, University of Johannesburg, South Africa
E-mail: mkolakovic@efzg.hr;mhewitt@uj.ac.za; leonjvr@uj.ac.za

Abstract - This study examines how artificial intelligence and automation reshape the concept of intellectual capital management (ICM) and implement it into entrepreneurial ventures and SMEs. As digital transformation accelerates, traditional conceptualizations of human, structural, and relational capital face fundamental challenges through machine learning systems, robotic process automation, and algorithmic decision-making. We investigate the tensions arising when AI systems augment or replace human expertise, codify organizational routines, and mediate stakeholder relationships, with particular emphasis on entrepreneurial contexts where resource constraints and innovation imperatives create unique IC dynamics. Drawing on recent empirical evidence from entrepreneurship research, we analyse measurement challenges inherent in quantifying hybrid human-machine contributions while addressing entrepreneurial considerations around competitive advantage, innovation capacity, and entrepreneurial orientation. Our findings reveal that successful IC management in entrepreneurial ventures under automation requires iterative integration strategies balancing techno logical capability with entrepreneurial adaptability, structural flexibility, and stakeholder relationship authenticity. We conclude that entrepreneurial organizations must leverage AI as catalyst for intellectual value creation, where entrepreneurial orientation moderates the relationship between IC and sustainable competitive advantage.

Keywords - Artificial Intelligence, Competitive Advantage, Digital Entrepreneurship, Intellectual Capital, SMEs.

I. INTRODUCTION

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and automation technologies into entrepreneurial ventures represents one of the most consequential shifts in how intellectual capital (IC) is constituted, deployed, and valued in the pursuit of competitive advantage. For entrepreneurs and small and medium enterprises (SMEs), this transformation carries unique implications as resource constraints, innovation imperatives, and dynamic market positioning strategies intersect with techno logical disruption [5]. Unlike earlier waves of technological adoption that primarily enhanced physical production capacity, AI-driven systems directly interact with knowledge processes at the core of entrepreneurial value creation and intellectual asset formation [7].

For entrepreneurial ventures, the strategic significance of AI adoption extends beyond operational efficiency to fundamentally reshape entrepreneurial opportunity recognition, innovation capacity, and competitive positioning [4]. AI technologies alter what constitutes valuable entrepreneurial expertise, how organizational knowledge persists as ventures scale, and through what channels entrepreneurial networks and stake holder trust are established [18]. Digital entrepreneurship increasingly depends on algorithmic capabilities for market intelligence, customer acquisition, and business model innovation [6].

Recent empirical evidence suggests that entrepreneurial ventures achieving superior innovation performance under digital transformation do so by treating technology as mediator rather than substitutefor existing IC dimensions, with entrepreneurial orientation playing a critical moderating role [5]. Entrepreneurial orientation, characterized by innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking propensity, shapes how ventures integrate IC with AI capabilities to achieve sustainable competitive advantage [16]. For SMEs in emerging markets, digital platforms enable entrepreneurs to overcome resource constraints by expanding relational reach through virtual collaboration networks and accessing global knowledge resources [13]. A particularly striking tension emerges around measurement practices in entrepreneurial contexts. Traditional quantitative approaches like the Value-Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC) struggle to attribute value when human and machine contributions become indistinguishable within integrated workflows, a challenge amplified in lean entrepreneurial ventures where resource attribution directly impacts investment decisions [17]. Entrepreneurial decision making increasingly depends on AI-enhanced business intelligence, yet the intellectual capital underlying these decisions reflects hybrid human-algorithmic contributions resistant to conventional accounting frameworks. This paper investigates how AI and automation reshape IC dynamics in entrepreneurial ventures across core dimensions, examines emerging measurement challenges unique to hybrid human-machine environments in SME contexts, and proposes adaptive frameworks for managing technological integration while

maintainingentrepreneurial agility and competitive positioning.

II. CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

A. Core Components and Interdependencies

Intellectual capital comprises intangible organizational resources spanning human, structural, relational, and increasingly informational dimensions. Human capital embodies individual skills, creativity, and adaptive cognitive capacities that fluctuate as employees acquire competencies or transfer tacit knowledge into formalized processes [14]. It represents not merely technical proficiency but also meta-cognitive abilities—critical thinking, ethical reasoning, creative synthesis.

Structural capital encompasses persistent knowledge infrastructures: databases, documented procedures, intellectual property, operational routines that remain with the firm regardless of staff turnover [10]. Unlike human capital's individual-cantered nature, structural capital represents codified organizational memory. In digital contexts, structural capital increasingly incorporates software architectures, data management systems, and algorithmic models embedded into production workflows.

Relational capital represents network connections and trust-based partnerships through which expertise flows and value creation extends beyond organizational boundaries [18]. This dimension captures relationships with customers, suppliers, strategic partners, and broader stakeholder communities.

The emergence of informational capital as distinct category reflects recognition that curated data assets, sensor generated metrics, algorithmic outputs hold strategic value separable from traditional classifications [9]. This expansion acknowledges data-driven innovation's centrality in contemporary business environments.

Critical to understanding IC under automation is recognizing interdependencies among these dimensions. Human expertise requires structural scaffolding to scale; structural systems gain value from creative human input loops; relational ties widen access horizons feeding back into both individual capacity and systemic adaptability. These interdependencies create multiplicative rather than additive value effects. Disrupting these linkages through poorly calibrated technology adoption risks undermining overall intellectual asset coherence despite nominal improvements in isolated metrics.

B. Human Capital Under Automation Pressure

Artificial intelligence's capacity to automate routine cognitive tasks—demand forecasting, pattern recognition in customer behaviour, micro-analysis of operational data—fundamentally alters the composition of valuable human capital [7]. This shift creates both liberation and displacement dynamics operating simultaneously within organizations. Offloading repetitive analytical work theoretically frees employees for complex creative undertakings requiring contextual judgment and strategic synthesis. However, such liberation presupposes organizational investment in upskilling programs and cultural spaces for meaningful engagement with higher-order problems.

Absent this complementary development, displacement risks emerge where technical staff no longer exercise com potencies by which their value was historically assessed. A financial analyst whose primary function involved spread sheet manipulation faces diminished relevance when machine learning models generate forecasts automatically. The locus of valuable expertise pivots toward meta-competencies: critical oversight of algorithmic outputs, interpretation of edge cases where models fail, ethical governance ensuring auto mated decisions align with organizational values [19].

This transition demands rapid workforce adaptation that many organizations struggle to facilitate effectively. The temporal mismatch between automation deployment speed and human capital renewal cycles produces friction. New AI systems arrive faster than training programs can retool employee skill bases, creating capability gaps that paradoxically reduce returns on expensive infrastructure investments [9].

Sector-specific patterns complicate universal prescriptions. In healthcare, AI diagnostic assistants augment rather than re place clinicians; medical expertise shifts toward validating algorithmic suggestions against patient histories and exercising judgment in ambiguous cases [14]. Manufacturing environments see different trajectories where sensor-equipped machinery reduces demand for manual quality inspection while raising premiums on systems oversight skills and predictive maintenance capabilities. Psychological dimensions deserve attention alongside technical considerations. Transparency in how AI systems function affects employee willingness to contribute tacit insights back into formal knowledge repositories [7]. Opaque algorithms perceived as threats to job security trigger defensive withholding of expertise that could improve system performance. Conversely, when automation is framed as augmentation tool with clear human oversight mechanisms, collaborative engagement often strengthens. Evidence from SME resilience during disruptions illustrates these dynamics. Firms that maintained performance amid COVID-19 shocks did so partly by expanding teams' intellectual agility and adaptive problem-solving capacity [12]. Where automation had been integrated iteratively alongside skill development, organizations possessed both technological infrastructure and human capability to pivot operations rapidly.

C. Structural Capital: Embedding Intelligence

Structural capital transformation under automation involves both enhancement and constraint dynamics. Robotic pro cess automation (RPA) systems integrating across enterprise resource planning (ERP) modules embed procedural logic directly into organizational backbones, maintaining workflow continuity without manual intervention once configured effectively [8]. This embeddedness offers stability advantages—codified knowledge persists independent of individual departures—yet engenders rigidity when processes must evolve quickly due to market flux or regulatory change. The paradox is that structural capital designed for efficiency optimization may undermine adaptive capacity central to dynamic competitive environments. Organizations face trade-offs between locking in best practices through automation and preserving flexibility for experimentation. Some evidence suggests that firms overinvesting in procedural automation without parallel emphasis on modular system architectures encounter brittleness during industry disruptions [9].

AI's contribution to structural capital extends beyond workflow automation into knowledge synthesis and decision support infrastructures. Machine learning models trained on historical operational data become organizational assets distinct from the individuals who developed them. A predictive maintenance algorithm encapsulating decades of equipment performance patterns represents structural capital accessible to any authorized user. Yet realizing this potential depends on integration quality—poorly documented models or systems lacking interoperability yield minimal value despite technical sophistication. Informational capital emerges prominently as data streams feeding AI systems accumulate into strategic resources [9]. Sensor networks generating real-time manufacturing telemetry, customer interaction logs capturing behavioural patterns, supply chain visibility platforms—all constitute informational assets whose value compounds through algorithmic processing. However, raw data abundance does not automatically translate into actionable intelligence. Structural capital must include interpretive frameworks connecting algorithmic outputs to decision contexts [7]. Governance challenges arise as AI-enhanced structural capital proliferates. Who owns algorithmic outputs when models blend proprietary data with open-source training sets? How should organizations audit black-box systems for bias or errors? These questions lack settled answers but carry material implications for structural capital integrity [19].

D. Relational Capital in Algorithm-Mediated Environments

Relational capital confronts perhaps the subtlest yet most consequential transformations under AI adoption. Digital customer service chatbots expand contact availability to 24/7 operation at low marginal cost, enabling consistent response quality [1]. Yet these efficiencies may come at the expense of trust depth traditionally rooted in human interaction's emotional resonance. Customers accustomed to personalized attention may experience automation as depersonalization, weakening loyalty bonds even as technical service metrics improve.

The strategic question becomes where to deploy automation versus preserving human touchpoints. Transactional queries—password resets, order status checks—suit algorithmic handling without relational damage. Complex negotiations, complaint resolutions, consultative selling—contexts requiring empathy or ethical judgment—often demand hu man presence to maintain relationship quality [1]. Business-to-business contexts reveal different dynamics. AI-enhanced collaboration platforms enable real-time data sharing among supply chain partners, creating informational transparency that builds trust through mutual visibility [9]. Predictive analytics shared across organizational boundaries support joint planning reducing coordination friction. However, algorithm-mediated relationships introduce new fragilities. Partners dependent on shared digital infrastructures faces concentrated risk if platform failures disrupt information flows. Trust may erode quickly when algorithmic errors propagate across networks—a demand forecasting mis take by one firm's AI system could cascade into inventory misalignments affecting multiple partners [8]. The ethical dimension of algorithm-mediated relationships grows more salient as AI systems gain sophistication. Generative models producing personalized marketing content risk manipulative persuasion tactics. Algorithmic reputation scoring systems raise fairness questions when black-box criteria disadvantage certain demographic groups. Maintaining relational capital vitality demands transparent governance ensuring automated interactions align with ethical norms [19]. Internal relational networks also shift under AI adoption. Collaboration tools with embedded analytics track team interaction patterns, potentially surfacing valuable insights about communication bottlenecks. Yet pervasive monitoring risks chilling informal exchanges that historically sustained tacit knowledge transfer [7]. Employees aware of surveillance may restrict spontaneous idea-sharing to formally sanctioned channels where creativity-supporting serendipity diminishes.

III. MEASUREMENT CHALLENGES

A. Attribution Dilemmas in Hybrid Systems

Assigning value to intellectual capital becomes exponentially more complex when AI systems contribute decisively to knowledge work outcomes. Traditional VAIC method ology calculates human capital efficiency by dividing value added by employee compensation costs [17]. This framework

assumes human labour as primary value driver. When algorithmic agents generate sales forecasts, design product prototypes, or optimize supply chain routing with minimal human oversight, conventional attribution logic fails. Should machine contributions be credited to the employees overseeing them? Should they be assigned to IT departments deploying systems? Or should they be treated as autonomous capital employed efficiency? Each choice carries implications for resource allocation decisions. Overattributing to hu man capital might sustain excessive headcount when automation could deliver equivalent outputs more efficiently. Over weighting capital employed might justify technology investments even when organizations lack absorption capacity [9]. The interdependency problem deepens when value emerges specifically from human-AI collaboration rather than either component independently. A medical diagnosis requiring both algorithmic pattern recognition and physician contextual judgment exemplifies this. Isolating discrete value contributions becomes artificial exercise divorced from actual value creation mechanics. Some researchers advocate treating such hybrid outputs as indivisible bundles for measurement purposes, accepting ambiguity as methodological honesty [7]. This approach ac knowledges measurement limitations explicitly while still providing directional guidance about overall IC trajectory. Temporal dimensions add further complexity. Human capital investments in training employees to work alongside AI systems may take years before manifesting performance gains. If evaluation occurs too soon after technology deployment, value gets wrongly assigned to automation alone [15]. Longitudinal tracking becomes essential for fair attribution across appropriate timelines.

B. Dynamic Measurement Under Rapid Change

Intellectual capital's composition shifts faster under AI adoption than traditional measurement frameworks accommodate. An organization integrating machine learning into operations might see informational capital surge in relevance as predictive models drive strategic decisions. Simultaneously, human capital emphasis pivots from technical execution toward algorithmic oversight and ethical governance [3]. These compositional shifts occur over compressed time frames—months rather than years—as cloud-based AI ser vices reduce deployment friction [18]. Static benchmarking anchored to past configurations will systematically mis attribute performance changes to outdated asset mixes. Real-time analytics promise more granular monitoring but introduce new problems. Tracking indicators continuously—employee engagement patterns on collaboration plat forms, supplier responsiveness times—yields volatile micro signals whose daily fluctuations mask strategic trends [15]. Without filtering mechanisms grounded in organizational priorities, managers drown in data rather than gaining clarity. Context-specificity complicates comparative benchmarking across organizations or time periods. A pharmaceutical firm's IC profile during AI-accelerated drug discovery differs funda mentally from its pre-automation state, making longitudinal performance assessment like comparing different entities [8]. Ethical measurement dimensions emerge as AI enables unprecedented workforce surveillance. Keystroke tracking, email sentiment analysis, communication pattern map ping—all theoretically enhance attribution precision yet pervasive monitoring risks eroding trust environments essential for healthy human and relational capital [19]. Short-term gains in measurement accuracy may trigger long-term value erosion through decreased discretionary effort. The proliferation of IC categories compounds measurement complexity. Adding informational capital, environ mental capital, digital capital to traditional human-structural relational tripods promises richer assessment but multiplies indicator requirements [3]. Managers juggling dozens of metrics without clear prioritization frameworks face decision paralysis.

IV. STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Navigating IC management under AI and automation demands iterative integration strategies that balance technological capability with entrepreneurial agility and organizational absorption capacity. Evidence from entrepreneurial ventures suggests that firms achieving superior outcomes treat technology adoption as phased process synchronized with workforce development, structural redesign, and stakeholder relationship recalibration [2]. Entrepreneurial orientation emerges as critical moderator determining how effectively IC components translate into competitive advantage through AI integration [5]. For entrepreneurial ventures, absorption capacity proves particularly relevant given resource constraints inherent to SME contexts. Organizations introducing sophisticated AI systems without ensuring complementary human capital readiness experience underutilization despite expensive investments [11]. Entrepreneurs must calibrate AI adoption to match organizational learning capacity and existing IC endowments to avoid resource misallocation. Structural flexibility emerges as critical success factor for entrepreneurial agility. Modular system architectures allowing rapid reconfiguration as AI capabilities evolve prevent the rigidity trap where early automation locks entrepreneurial ventures into obsolete processes [9]. This requires intentional design choices prioritizing adaptability over short-term efficiency maximization—a strategic orientation aligned with entrepreneurial innovation imperatives. Digital

entrepreneurship increasingly depends on algorithm mediated business models where relational authenticity becomes strategic differentiator [6]. Entrepreneurial ventures preserving genuine human engagement at critical stakeholder interfaces while deploying automation judiciously for routine transactions maintain stronger loyalty and trust networks essential for entrepreneurial success [1]. From entrepreneurial decision-making perspective, AI capabilities in data-driven insight generation significantly enhance innovation capacity and competitive positioning when integrated with strong IC foundations [4]. However, automation's transformative power depends on entrepreneurial orientation moderating how IC dimensions interact with technological capabilities to create sustainable competitive advantage. Sector-specific customization remains essential for entrepreneurial ventures despite general principles' applicability. Knowledge-intensive entrepreneurship requires different integration strategies than transaction-processing businesses. Emerging market SMEs face distinct constraints from developed-economy ventures [13]. Universal prescriptions fail because optimal IC management depends fundamentally on entrepreneurial context, resource availability, and competitive dynamics.

V. CONCLUSION

Our analysis reveals several critical insights for entrepreneurial ventures. First, human capital in digital entrepreneurship evolves toward meta-competencies of algorithmic oversight, ethical governance, and creative synthesis as routine cognitive tasks migrate to automated systems. Entrepreneurs must invest proactively in workforce development that anticipates this shift while maintaining entrepreneurial agility [4]. Second, structural capital in entrepreneurial ventures must balance procedural embedding against adaptive flexibility enabling rapid reconfiguration, a core requirement for entrepreneurial responsiveness to market dynamics [9]. Third, relational capital in digital entrepreneurship demands strategic segmentation between algorithm-suitable transactions and authenticity-requiring interactions that build entrepreneurial networks and stakeholder trust [6]. Fourth, entrepreneurial orientation significantly moderates how IC com ponents interact with AI capabilities to generate sustainable competitive advantage, with innovation capacity serving as critical mediator [5].

Measurement challenges intensify in entrepreneurialcontexts where resource attribution directly impacts investment decisions and competitive positioning. Traditional quantitative approaches require augmentation with entrepreneurial performance metrics capturing innovation outcomes, market responsiveness, and competitive advantage generation. Hybrid measurement frameworks integrating financial proxies with qualitative entrepreneurial insights reveal interdependencies that conventional metrics miss. Strategic implications center on entrepreneurial calibration: synchronizing technology deployment with venture specific absorption capacity; designing modular structural architectures supporting entrepreneurial agility; preserving relational authenticity at critical stakeholder touchpoints; implementing blended measurement frameworks aligned with entrepreneurial goals; leveraging entrepreneurial orientation as strategic moderator of IC-performance relationships. Future research should pursue longitudinal studies tracking IC transformation trajectories in entrepreneurial ventures across varied contexts, refined attribution methodologies capturing hybrid human-AI contributions in SME settings, investigation of entrepreneurial orientation as moderator affecting IC-performance linkages under automation, and policy-oriented research examining interventions facilitating equitable entrepreneurial IC development amid AI's disruptive potential. As AI capabilities continue advancing, intellectual capital theory in entrepreneurship must evolve alongside, maintaining conceptual coherence while accommodating socio technical realities reshaping digital entrepreneurship fundamentally. Entrepreneurial ventures achieving this balance will convert technological disruption into sustained competitive advantage grounded in robust, adaptive IC portfolios leveraged through strong entrepreneurial orientation. The pathway forward involves thoughtful synthesis where entrepreneurial creativity and machine intelligence coexist in productive tension, driving innovation and competitive advantage in the digital economy.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Ahmed, S. H. Bhatti, I. Golgeci, and A. Arslan, ¨ "Digital platform capability and organizational agility of emerging market manufacturing SMEs: The mediating role of intellectual capital," Technological Forecast ing and Social Change, 2022.

[2] F. Akhtar, A. Senadjki, and V. V. Kumaran, "Navigating the digital era: Role of intellectual capital in enhancing the financial performance," Journal of Intellectual Cap ital, 2025. (in press)

[3] E. Albertini, F. Berger-Remy, L. Morgan, and M. Petkovic, "A fresh look at intellectual capital in the post-industrial era," in Contemporary Issues in Intellectual Capital Management, 2018.

[4] Y. H. S. Al-Mamary, "The transformative power of artificial intelligence in entrepreneurship: Exploring AI's capabilities for the success of entrepreneurial ventures," Future Business Journal, vol. 11, 2025.

[5] M. A. Alshahrani, M. Yaqub, and M. A. Alabdali, "Examining the role of intellectual capital in maturing sustainable competitive advantage through enkindling innovations in SMEs: The moderating role of entrepreneurship-orientation," Journal of Intellectual Capital, vol. 25, no. 2/3, pp. 536–560, 2024.

[6] M. C. E. Bourezig and S. C. T. Bouguerri, "The intersection of AI and digital entrepreneurship: Studying the varied ways

that AI is changing digital enterprises," Management and Economics Review, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 77–91, 2024.

[7] S. Cabrilo, L. U ˇ zien ˇ e, and A. Kianto, "Rethinking the ˙ future of intellectual capital: Emerging perspectives in IC theory and practice," in ECKM 2025: Proceedings of the 25th European Conference on Knowledge Management, 2025.

[8] S. Cabrilo, R. Leung, F.-S. Tsai, and S. Dahms, "I ˇ am served by a Robot!: Internal antecedents of customeracceptance of robotic hotel-service agents," Journal of Organizational Change Management, 2024. DOI: 10.1108/jocm-08-2023-0315.

[9] Fariza and T. Winarsih, "A conceptual framework for intellectual capital to drive digital transformation in Indonesia's transportation sector," Asia-Pacific Manage ment and Business Application, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 189– 208, 2025.

[10] M. Kolakovic, B. Moric Milovanovic, and M. Turuk, "Influence of intellectual capital efficiency on the profitability of Croatian public listed companies," Global Business & Economics Anthology, 2010.

[11] T. Mahmood and M. S. Mubarik, "Balancing innovation and exploitation in the fourth industrial revolution: Role of intellectual capital and technology absorptive capacity," Technological Forecasting & Social Change, vol. 160, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120287.

[12] A. T. S. Wicaksono, M. A. Mufraini, T. Miranti, and J. W. Hidayat, "Bitcoin vs gold: Which one is the most powerful in boosting the shariah equity index? Global evidence," Studies in Business and Economics, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 267–288, 2023. DOI: 10.2478/sbe 2023-0001.

[13] M. Musman et al., "A decade of research on intellectual capital and SMEs performance in the ASEAN region: A bibliometric analysis," Future Business Journal, 189, 2025.

[14] S. Onaran and E. S. Yurtkoru, "The effects of digital transformation and intellectual capital on organizational resilience in the healthcare industry," Journal of Research in Business, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 235–250, 2024. DOI: 10.54452/jrb.1489717.

[15] E. Pedro, J. Leitao, and H. Alves, "Screening and enhancing intellectual capital consistency: A scoping re view of systematised literature reviews," Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, vol. 10, no. 1, 2025. DOI: 10.1016/j.jik.2025.100615.

★★★