UDC: 005.21:339.137
005.336.4
COBISS.SR-ID 171305993
doi: https://doi.org/10.61837/mbuir030125039p

REVIEW SCIENTIFIC PAPER

RECEIVED: 18. 04. 2024.
ACCEPTED: 15. 05. 2025.

INFLUENCE OF INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL ON BUSINESS PERFORMANCE AND CREATION OF COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE

Danijela P. PAROJČIĆ

MB University, Faculty of Business and Law, Belgrade, Serbia
danijelaparojcic@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0923-2620

Milan Lj. STAMATOVIĆ

MB University, Faculty of Business and Law, Belgrade, Serbia
stamatovicm@sbb.rs
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0471-6447

Aleksa D. PAROJČIĆ

Erste Bank, Beograd, Serbia
aleksaparojcic@gmail.com

Abstract: *The accelerated pace of globalization over the past few decades has brought about significant technological, political, economic, and social changes that have reshaped the global economy and influenced how organizations perform, acquire value, and build competitive advantages. Intellectual capital has become one of the most important factors for achieving better performance of organizations by applying new knowledge, skills and innovative ideas, which are a prerequisite for business expansion and competitiveness. The modern economy is an economy based on knowledge and its competitiveness is based on high technologies, innovations, the creation of multinational and transnational companies and corporations, and global networking. Every organization strives for a sustainable competitive advantage that allows it not only to survive in the market but also to have continuous recognition, growth and development. The aim of this paper is to determine the impact of intellectual capital on business performance, which will enable the organization to create a continuous competitive advantage as the starting point of any successful organizational business.*

Keywords: *intellectual capital, human capital, structural capital, organizational performance, competitive advantage*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the modern business environment, characterized by constant changes, high competition and growing market demands, the key challenge for organizations is how to create and maintain a competitive advantage. Traditional business models no longer provide long-term stability, but success is increasingly based on an organization's ability to quickly adapt, innovate and efficiently use its intangible resources. Thus, intellectual capital becomes one of the most important factors affecting business performance and long-term sustainability of competitive advantage. Intellectual capital represents the integration of three key components - human, structural and client capital - which together form the basis of organizational knowledge and potential. Human capital includes knowledge, skills, experience and motivation of employees; structural capital means formalized processes, technology, intellectual property and organizational infrastructure, while customer equity refers to customer relationships, trust, loyalty and reputation in the marketplace. Effective management of these components creates a synergistic effect that directly affects the innovation, operational efficiency and market recognition of the organization. It is this ability to use intellectual capital as a strategic resource that makes the difference between average and highly competitive organizations. Those organizations that successfully integrate human, structural and client capital into their business models demonstrate greater agility and resilience, recognize opportunities for growth more easily and adapt to change more quickly. Such organizations not only create a competitive advantage, but also maintain it in the long term, because they build foundations that are difficult to imitate by competitors. The aim of this paper is to point out the importance of effective management of intellectual capital as a foundation for achieving competitive superiority, analyzing its components and the way in which, through their integration, organizations can survive and succeed in modern conditions of market chaos.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS OF INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL AND THEIR APPLICATION

Intellectual capital is often viewed through its basic components (human, structural and relational capital), although a deeper understanding of its impact on performance and competitive advantage is possible precisely through the application of relevant theoretical models. Key contributions in this area come from authors such as Barney (1991), Sveiby (1997), and Teece (1997, 2007), whose models draw on the different perspectives of organizational resource theory and dynamic capabilities theory.

2.1 Barney's resource-based approach (RBV) model and human capital

One of the most influential theoretical frameworks for understanding the competitive advantage of organizations is the Resource-Based View (RBV), developed by Jay Barney. The basic thesis of this approach is that long-term competitive advantage does not come from external factors, but from internal resources that the organization possesses and uses successfully. According to Barney (1991), in order for a resource to contribute to a sustainable competitive advantage, it must meet four key criteria - it must be valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable - which is often denoted by the acronym VRIN in the literature.

Human capital, as part of intellectual capital, can be one of the most important sources of competitive advantage. Employees' knowledge, expertise, creativity, experience, and problem-solving skills are often resources that meet all VRIN criteria. Highly specialized knowledge or a unique combination of employee competencies represent resources that are difficult to replicate by competitors, making them rare and hard-to-substitute sources of competitive advantage. Many elements of human capital, such as tacit knowledge (informal, unwritten knowledge gained through experience), are also not easily transferable, nor can they be quickly learned or imported, which further enhances its strategic value. The RBV model has its critics, with one of the primary criticisms being that it does not adequately explain the processes through which organizations acquire, develop, and sustain their superior resources. RBV describes what a resource is when it already exists in an organization, but does not sufficiently explain the dynamic capabilities that enable organizations to continuously renew and improve their human capital.

2.2 Teece's model of dynamic capabilities

David Teece, in collaboration with Pisano and Shuen (1997), developed the concept of dynamic capabilities in response to the limitations of the traditional resource-based approach (RBV). While RBV emphasizes the importance of having resources that are valuable, rare, and difficult to imitate, Teece's model goes a step further, focusing on how organizations can continuously develop, transform, and renew their resources in the face of uncertainty, competitive pressures, and technological change.

Teece defines dynamic capabilities as a firm's ability to integrate, develop, and recombine internal and external competencies to respond to a changing environment. Intellectual capital, which includes knowledge, experience, innovation and creativity of employees, thus becomes a key strategic resource. The emphasis is not only on the possession of knowledge, but also on the organization's ability to effectively use, develop and transfer that knowledge throughout the entire system.

One of the fundamental elements of dynamic capabilities is organizational learning, which enables firms to quickly adapt, innovate, and anticipate changes in market and technological conditions. In this process, digital transformation, collaboration within and outside organizational boundaries, as well as flexible forms of work become important tools for strengthening dynamic capabilities.

Teece's framework is particularly applicable to fast-moving industries such as information technology, biotechnology, the energy sector and the creative industries, where the ability to adapt and innovate is often the difference between leaders and laggards. In those sectors, organizations that successfully develop and deploy dynamic capabilities can anticipate change, manage risks more effectively, and achieve sustainable competitive advantage. Successful organizations do not rely exclusively on static resources, but invest in mechanisms for continuous improvement of employee competencies, development of internal processes for knowledge sharing and systemic problem solving, thereby creating the basis for long-term agility and strategic renewal, which is the essence of Teece's model.

2.3 Karl-Erik Sveiby's model - The perspective of knowledge as a resource

Karl-Erik Sveiby is one of the pioneers of the modern concept of knowledge management, whose contribution is particularly important for the understanding of intellectual capital as a strategic resource. Within his model, Sveiby does not treat knowledge as a static element, but as a dynamic resource that is developed, transferred and used through various organizational processes.

His model divides intellectual capital into three interconnected components:

- Human capital includes the knowledge, skills, experience and creativity of employees, who represent the main carriers of organizational knowledge.
- Internal structure includes organizational processes, databases, information systems, culture, values and patents, and enables internal generation and application of knowledge.
- External structure includes relationships with clients, suppliers, partners, as well as reputation, brand and market position.

What constitutes the essence of Sveiby's approach is the emphasis on the processes of transfer and transformation of knowledge, and not only on its accumulation, which means that the value of knowledge is not only reflected in its existence in the organization, but in the firm's ability to make it available, useful and operational - in real time and in accordance with the needs of the business environment.

In the context of gaining and maintaining a competitive advantage, organizations that successfully connect these three forms of intellectual capital can better respond to changes, innovate faster and build stable relationships with external stakeholders. Such firms use knowledge as an active basis for making decisions, creating value and shaping long-term strategies.

In today's digital and rapidly changing business environment, Sveiby's model gains additional relevance because it shows that just possessing knowledge is not enough - but the key is in its organization, exchange and strategic use, which transforms organizational knowledge from a potential into a concrete advantage on the market.

2.4 Critical review of the application of the model in practice

Although all the mentioned models confirm the importance of intellectual capital, the question of their practical operationalization arises. For example, it is difficult to quantify and accurately measure human capital without subjective factors. These models also often do not sufficiently include the macroeconomic and institutional context, which is especially important for countries in transition like Serbia. In these conditions, organizations face additional challenges such as "brain drain", underinvestment in R&D and low digital literacy, which can limit the effects of intellectual capital.

2.5 Model synthesis

By synthesizing the aforementioned theoretical approaches, it is possible to construct an integrative framework in which:

- from RBV takes over the importance of resources (especially intangible ones),
- from dynamic abilities, the importance of organizational flexibility and learning ability,
- from Sveiby's model, the importance of interaction with external and internal knowledge carriers.

Such a framework enables a holistic understanding of how organizations can not only possess, but also develop, transform and exploit intellectual capital, thereby increasing the chances of sustainable competitive advantage.

2.6 Examples from practice of applying theoretical frameworks of intellectual capital

- Nordeus (Serbia) develops competitive advantage through investment in human capital - highly trained software engineers and creatives. The focus on team culture, internal training and knowledge development creates hard-to-imitate resources, which confirms the relevance of the RBV (Resource-Based View) approach. The success of Top Eleven is the result of these invisible resources.
- Infostud Group (Serbia) implements systematic knowledge management through internal wiki platforms, peer-to-peer training and transparent communication. In this way, it develops and maintains organizational and social capital, which ensures the continuity of knowledge and innovation in case of staff rotation.
- Ericsson Nikola Tesla (Croatia) applies the model of dynamic capabilities through agile work methods, strategic partnerships and continuous training of employees. These capabilities enable rapid adaptation to market changes in the highly competitive telecommunications sector.
- SAP (Germany) combines theoretical approaches to intellectual capital management - RBV through specialized personnel, KM (Knowledge Management) through digital knowledge bases and training, and dynamic capabilities through continuous development (e.g. transition to cloud and AI). This integration provides a sustainable competitive advantage.
- Hemofarm (Serbia) develops expert capital through research and development, cooperation with scientific institutions and continuous education of employees. As part of a highly regulated sector, it uses knowledge as a foundation for innovation and market stability, confirming the applicability of theoretical models in the pharmaceutical industry as well.

The above examples indicate that the application of theoretical frameworks of intellectual capital depends on the sector, the degree of digitization, as well as the strategic goals of the organization itself. In practice, the most successful firms integrate multiple theoretical models – they do not rely only on static resources, but develop capabilities for continuous learning, collaboration and innovation.

3. HUMAN CAPITAL - CRITICAL REVIEW, THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PRACTICE

Human capital is an increasingly important concept in the modern knowledge economy. Although once the key resources of organizations were material factors, in recent decades there has been a shift in focus towards people — their knowledge, skills, motivation and creativity. Human capital is defined as a set of competencies that individuals possess and that contribute to organizational success. However, this concept is not without controversies and challenges, nor is there a single approach to its understanding and operationalization.

3.1 Theoretical models and approaches to human capital

Approaches to human capital can be classified into several theoretical frameworks, which differ from each other in terms of focus:

- The economic approach (Gary Becker, Theodore Schultz) is an approach that views human capital as an economic resource that can be invested in (education, training) and that generates future income. Becker (1964) was the first to quantify investments in human capital, noting that education and training increase employee productivity, leading to higher wages and economic growth. A criticism of this model is that it often ignores the psychological, organizational and cultural aspects of the role of employees, as well as the fact that all forms of investment do not guarantee equal returns.
- The organizational approach (Davenport, 1999) views human capital in the context of employees' contribution to the strategic success of the organization. The focus is on the ability to transfer knowledge within structures and teams. A criticism of this model is that Davenport highlights the challenge of retaining employees whose contribution is extremely high, thereby further complicating the management of "knowledge drain" risks.
- Intellectual capital (Sveiby, 1997) is a model that views human capital as part of the broader concept of intellectual capital, which includes both structural and relational capital. Human capital is the knowledge that employees take with them, while structural capital is what remains in the organization when they leave. The criticism of this model is that there is no clear answer to the question of where personal capital ends and organizational capital begins - especially in the case of tacit knowledge.

3.2 Critical review in the form of challenges in practice

Although theoretical models recognize the importance of human capital, practice shows a number of challenges, such as:

- Employees change their goals, career paths and loyalties, making the planning process difficult. Example: Google faces the so-called "great resignation" wave that requires new models of talent engagement.
- Most valuable knowledge remains "in the heads" of employees. Companies like Microsoft therefore develop complex internal knowledge transfer platforms (eg Teams + SharePoint + Viva Insights) to make knowledge shareable and keep it within the system.
- Companies like Nordeus and Infostud in Serbia consciously develop employer branding and internal knowledge academies in order to retain and develop staff.
- The need for new knowledge puts pressure on L&D sectors. Infostud, for example, uses agile training and digital platforms for continuous development.

3.3 Human capital and social development

In the context of wider society, human capital is associated with the following:

- Education and innovations in the form of increased investment in STEM education that contributes to technological development (example: Digital Serbia Initiative).

- Companies like IKEA implement inclusion policies that directly contribute to greater engagement of women and marginalized groups.

Human capital remains a crucial but complex concept. Although theories offer significant insights, practice shows that managing this resource is increasingly demanding. Future research should focus on:

- Measures to retain tacit knowledge within the organization
- Comparison of national human capital development policies.
- The role of digital transformation in the development of individual capacities.

4. STRUCTURAL CAPITAL - CRITICAL REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Structural capital represents one of the three basic pillars of intellectual capital, along with human and relational capital (Edvinsson & Malone, 1997). It includes the intangible but formally organized resources and capacities of the organization that enable employees to be productive and innovative. This includes organizational structure, systems, procedures, information, technology, but also intellectual property such as patents and brands (Bontis, 1999).

While many authors underline its importance for operational efficiency and sustainability (Stewart, 1997; Roos et al., 1997), there is a lack of consensus regarding its scope and impact on long-term competitiveness. For example, while Bontis (1999) points out that structural capital is "a platform that enables the transformation of knowledge into organizational value", other authors, like Sveiby (2001), warn that without human capital, structural resources remain inert and underutilized. This dichotomy points to the importance of their integration, but also raises the question - do modern models overemphasize the formal structure, while neglecting the adaptive capacity of the system?

A critical approach at the same time requires the analysis of different models of structural capital. The Skandia Navigator model (Edvinsson & Malone, 1997) distinguishes organizational and innovation capital as its subsystems, where innovation capital includes intellectual property and improvement processes. In contrast, the Intangible Assets Monitor model (Sveiby, 2001) focuses more on flows and capacities than on the structure and ownership of knowledge. A comparative analysis of these models indicates that Skandia's approach relies more on measurable and proprietary components, while Sveiby's model is more process-oriented. Both, however, do not sufficiently take into account the challenges of modern disruptive technologies and digitalization that redefine traditional notions of structure and stability.

Authors such as Marr, Schiuma and Neely (2004) propose an extended model that includes the so-called "configurational capital", which includes the organization's ability to reconfigure resources in accordance with changes in the environment. This perspective opens up the scope for expanding the traditional notion of structural capital to include both agility and digital transformation. Right here lies one of the most important contemporary challenges, how to establish flexible and at the same time reliable structures that support innovation and enable rapid learning and adaptation?

There is also a need for greater theoretical precision when it comes to the role of structural capital in different contexts, such as in highly regulated industries such as pharmaceuticals, where legal aspects of intellectual property play a crucial role, while in creative industries the importance of organizational flexibility and open innovation dominates. Many studies in the literature fail to adequately distinguish this contextual dimension, highlighting a theoretical gap that future research could address (Kianto et al., 2010).

In addition, the challenge analysis shows that the management of structural capital in the era of digitalization is increasingly complex. The need for continuous investments, rapid technology obsolescence, as well as legal and ethical constraints create additional tensions between long-term planning and operational flexibility (Dumay, 2016). In the literature, the approach of "designed structural capital" - modular, decentralized and directed towards sustainability - is increasingly being proposed.

Structural capital is a multidimensional concept whose importance is growing in modern organizational conditions, although there are both significant theoretical and practical challenges that require further analysis. It is necessary to delineate the components of structural capital more precisely depending on the industrial and technological context, analyze their interdependence with other forms of intellectual capital and develop new approaches that include flexibility, sustainability and digital resilience as key characteristics of successful organizations.

5. ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE - CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THEORETICAL MODELS AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Organizational performance represents the measure in which the organization succeeds in achieving its strategic goals, meeting the needs of stakeholders and ensuring long-term sustainability in a dynamic environment. In the literature, this concept is viewed from different angles, from quantitative performance indicators (financial results, productivity) to qualitative aspects such as employee satisfaction, innovation and social responsibility (Richard et al., 2009; Kaplan & Norton, 1996). The multidimensionality of this concept requires complex approaches to performance measurement and management.

5.1 Critical review of approaches in the literature

Traditional models of organizational performance, such as Cameron and Whetten's (1983) effectiveness model, emphasize different dimensions of performance (goal achievement, internal effectiveness, adaptability, and stakeholder satisfaction). Nevertheless, critics claim that such models often do not include complex interactions between internal and external factors, especially in modern organizations that operate in conditions of frequent changes.

The Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan & Norton, 1996), on the other hand, provides an integrated framework that includes financial and non-financial indicators (customers, internal processes, learning and development), but its application can be limited if the organization does not possess the ability of systems thinking and horizontal coordination. In addition, research shows that there is a serious gap between the theoretical design of these systems and their actual implementation (Neely et al., 2005).

5.2 Comparison of theoretical models and synthesis of approaches (Table 1)

By comparing the approaches to effectiveness, it is possible to see differences in the focus of the model:

Table 1 - Comparison of theoretical models and synthesis of approaches

Model / Author	*Focus*	*Advantage*	*Limitation*
Cameron & Whetten (1983)	Multidimensional effectiveness	Flexible approach for different contexts	Difficulty in identifying priorities
Kaplan & Norton (1996)	Integrated performance indicators	Strategy orientation	Complexity of implementation
Weick (1976) – Loose Coupling	Adaptability and flexibility	Understanding organizational uncertainty	Difficulty in measuring performance
McKinsey 7S Framework	Integration of structure, strategy and people	Holistic approach	Lack of quantitative validation

These models offer different insights, but none are universal. The key synthesis lies in combining structural and dynamic factors – from formal processes to culture, innovation and learning.

5.3 Strengths and weaknesses of organizational performance - theoretical and empirical insight

An organization's strengths often include high employee motivation, innovative capacity, efficient internal processes, and financial stability. Empirical research confirms that organizations with a strong "learning culture" (Senge, 1990) achieve better long-term performance, especially in unstable environments. Denison's model also shows that dimensions such as employee engagement and strategic orientation directly correlate with business results (Denison, 2000).

Weaknesses such as poor leadership, limited resources, poor quality control and ineffective communication, on the other hand, remain major challenges. A critical review indicates that many organizations fail to adequately diagnose weaknesses due to a lack of systematic data collection and analysis (Behn, 2003).

5.4 Performance monitoring and strategy adjustment

Modern organizations increasingly use performance dashboards, KPI indicators and systematic analyses to manage performance. According to Bourne et al. (2000), the challenge is not only in measurement, but also in the interpretation of data and turning the results into concrete actions. The key is to view performance not as a static outcome, but as a dynamic process of continuous learning and adaptation. Performance monitoring must include feedback from the market as well as internal evaluations that lead to continuous improvement.

Organizational performance is a complex and multidimensional concept that requires a critical understanding of theoretical models, comparison of different approaches and the ability to integrate qualitative and quantitative indicators. Future analyses should focus more on:

- the difference between declarative and actual performance management strategies;
- the role of digital transformation and analytics in performance monitoring;
- and a deeper understanding of how organizations can develop resilience in the face of uncertainty.

Such approach enables not only descriptive analysis, but also prescriptive recommendations that help organizations identify realistic points of progress and adaptation.

6. COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE

In modern, unpredictable and turbulent business conditions, the key challenge for any organization is to create and maintain a competitive advantage. Unlike the traditional period when organizations enjoyed relative stability and responded to occasional changes, today they are in an almost constant state of adaptation. Organizations are forced to continuously adapt their strategies, processes and resources in order to survive and thrive in complex and dynamic market conditions.

Competitive advantage is defined as the ability of an organization to achieve superior performance compared to its competition. According to Porter (1985), competitive advantage arises from the value that an organization manages to create for its customers, which exceeds the costs of that creation. This advantage can be the result of lower costs (cost leadership), differentiation or focusing on a specific market segment (focus strategy). Newer models also indicate the importance of organizational resources and capabilities (Barney, 1991), whereby resources that are valuable, rare, difficult to imitate and organizationally supported (VRIO) are considered the basis of long-term competitive advantage.

One of the most important sources of competitive advantage in modern business is intellectual capital, which includes three key components:

- Human capital - knowledge, skills, creativity and competencies of employees;
- Structural capital – systems, procedures, knowledge bases and technology of the organization;

- Customer equity – customer relationships, trust, loyalty and brand image.

According to the authors Stewart (1997) and Edvinsson & Malone (1997), competitive advantage based on intellectual capital is created through the synergy between human potential, effective organizational structures and lasting relationships with customers. An organization that successfully manages this capital acquires the ability to innovate, react agilely to changes and build recognition on the market.

An important concept in modern approaches to competitive advantage is knowledge management, which enables the accumulation, sharing and application of knowledge in order to improve performance. Alavi & Leidner (2001) emphasize that knowledge management contributes to the creation of organizational intelligence, and thus to the long-term differentiation and resilience of the organization.

A critical review of the literature indicates that there are different interpretations of competitive advantage - while classical economic theory emphasizes market positions and strategic choices, resource-oriented approaches pay more attention to the organization's internal capabilities. Some authors (Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997) go a step further by introducing the concept of dynamic capabilities, emphasizing that organizations must develop capabilities for rapid learning and transformation in order to maintain a competitive position in conditions of constant change.

Competitive advantage is not static, it can be temporary if competitors quickly imitate its sources, so the key is continuous innovation and investment in resources that are difficult for competitors, such as authentic corporate culture, unique user experiences, or brands with emotional value.

The lack of systematic analysis of different models of competitive advantage in the theoretical and practical literature can lead to a limited understanding of the sources of success. There is a need for a deeper synthesis and comparison of the views of different authors in order to identify gaps in knowledge and discover innovative strategies that would provide organizations with a lasting competitive advantage.

7. CONCLUSION

Effective management of intellectual capital is one of the key factors for improving business performance and achieving a sustainable competitive advantage. Intellectual capital, made up of human and structural capital, enables organizations to develop the knowledge, innovation and flexibility necessary to operate successfully in a modern, dynamic environment. Human capital, through investment in the competencies and motivation of employees, contributes to the creation of value and innovation, while structural capital provides support for the efficient use of that knowledge through processes, technology and organizational culture. Measuring and monitoring organizational performance enables timely evaluation and adjustment of strategies, which further strengthens the organization's ability to respond to changes and maintain its competitive position. In conclusion, systemic and strategic management of intellectual capital is the foundation for long-term growth, resilience and success of the organization in the market.

REFERENCES

[1] Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, 25 (1), 107–136. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961

[2] Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17 (1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

[3] Becker, G. S. (1964). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education. University of Chicago Press.

[4] Behn, R. D. (2003). Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures. Public Administration Review, 63 (5), 586–606. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00322

[5] Bontis, N. (1999). Managing organizational knowledge by diagnosing intellectual capital: Framing and advancing the state of the field. International Journal of Technology Management, 18(5–8), 433–462. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTM.1999.002780

[6] Bourne, M., Neely, A., Mills, J., & Platts, K. (2000). Designing, implementing and updating performance measurement systems. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 20 (7), 754–771. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570010330739

[7] Cameron, K. S., & Whetten, D. A. (1983). Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. Academic Press.

[8] Davenport, T. H. (1999). Human capital: What it is and why people invest in it. Jossey-Bass.

[9] Denison, D. R. (2000). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A theory and some preliminary empirical evidence. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), Handbook of organizational culture and climate (pp. 105–119). Sage Publications.

[10] Dumay, J. (2016). A critical reflection on the future of intellectual capital: From reporting to disclosure. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 17 (1), 168–184. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-08-2015-0072

[11] Edvinsson, L., & Malone, M. S. (1997). Intellectual capital: Realizing your company's true value by finding its hidden brainpower. HarperBusiness.

[12] Google. (n.d.). Workforce trends and the Great Resignation. Preuzeto sa https://www.google.com/

[13] IKEA. (n.d.). Inkluzivna politika zapošljavanja. Preuzeto sa https://www.ikea.com/

[14] Infostud. (n.d.). O nama – Razvoj kadrova i učenje. Preuzeto sa https://www.infostud.com/

[15] Inicijativa Digitalna Srbija. (n.d.). O nama. Preuzeto sa https://www.dsi.rs/

[16] Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action. Harvard Business School Press.

[17] Kianto, A., Ritala, P., Spender, J. C., & Vanhala, M. (2010). The interaction of intellectual capital assets and knowledge management practices in organizational value creation. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 11 (4), 436–457. https://doi.org/10.1108/14691931011085675

[18] Marr, B., Schiuma, G., & Neely, A. (2004). The dynamics of value creation: Mapping your intellectual performance drivers. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 5 (2), 312–325. https://doi.org/10.1108/14691930410533722

[19] McKinsey & Company. (n.d.). The 7S Framework. Preuzeto sa https://www.mckinsey.com

[20] Microsoft. (n.d.). Microsoft Viva – Empowering every employee. Preuzeto sa https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/microsoft-viva

[21] Neely, A., Adams, C., & Kennerley, M. (2005). The performance prism: The scorecard for measuring and managing business success. Financial Times Prentice Hall.

[22] Nordeus. (n.d.). Nordeus Hub i razvoj talenata. Preuzeto sa https://www.nordeus.com/

[23] Porter, M. E. (1985). Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance. Free Press.

[24] Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice. Journal of Management, 35 (3), 718–804. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308330560

[25] Roos, J., Roos, G., Dragonetti, N. C., & Edvinsson, L. (1997). Intellectual capital: Navigating in the new business landscape. Macmillan Press.

[26] Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. The American Economic Review, 51 (1), 1–17.

[27] Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization. Doubleday/Currency.

[28] Stewart, T. A. (1997). Intellectual capital: The new wealth of organizations. Doubleday/Currency.

[29] Sveiby, K. E. (1997). The new organizational wealth: Managing and measuring knowledge-based assets. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

[30] Sveiby, K. E. (2001). A knowledge-based theory of the firm to guide strategy formulation. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 2(4), 344–358. https://doi.org/10.1108/14691930110409651

[31] Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

[32] Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18 (7), 509–533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7](https://doi.org/10.1002/%28SICI%291097-0266%28199708%2918:7)<509::AID-SM-J882>3.0.CO;2-Z

[33] Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391875

UTICAJ INTELEKTUALNOG KAPITALA NA POSLOVNE UČINKE I STVARANJE KONKURENTSKIH PREDNOSTI

Rezime: *Ubrzani tempo globalizacije tokom poslednjih nekoliko decenija doveo je do značajnih tehnoloških, političkih, ekonomskih i društvenih promena koje su preoblikovale globalnu ekonomiju i uticale na to kako organizacije posluju, stiču vrednost i grade konkurentske prednosti. Intelektualni kapital je postao jedan od najvažnijih faktora za postizanje boljih performansi organizacija primenom novih znanja, veština i inovativnih ideja, koje su preduslov za širenje poslovanja i konkurentnost. Savremena ekonomija je ekonomija zasnovana na znanju, a njena konkurentnost se zasniva na visokim tehnologijama, inovacijama, stvaranju multinacionalnih i transnacionalnih kompanija i korporacija i globalnom umrežavanju. Svaka organizacija teži održivoj konkurentskoj prednosti koja joj omogućava ne samo opstanak na tržištu, već i kontinuirano priznanje, rast i razvoj. Cilj ovog rada je da se utvrdi uticaj intelektualnog kapitala na poslovne performanse, što će omogućiti organizaciji da stvori kontinuiranu konkurentsku prednost kao polaznu tačku svakog uspešnog organizacionog poslovanja.*

Ključne reči: *intelektualni kapital, ljudski kapital, strukturni kapital, organizacione performanse, konkurentska prednost*