RESEARCH ARTICLE

Redefining Entrepreneurship for the Digital and AI Era: A Systematic Theoretical Review and Conceptual Framework

PhD Student

Hudhoodha Waheedha

Department of Economics and Management, Khazar University, Baku, Azerbaijan

Maldives

Email: waheed.hudhoodha2021@khazar.org, https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6263-6810

Doi Serial https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/8.6.56

Keywords Entrepreneurship development, Entrepreneurship Definition, Entrepreneurship Evolution, Digital Business

Abstract

Entrepreneurship theories have traditionally revolved around innovation, uncertainty, and finding opportunity. This is no longer the case with the advent of digital platforms and AI. This research embarks on a systematic theoretical analysis, tracing the evolution of entrepreneurship over four phases: classical, opportunity, digital, and AI-based. Findings reveal how entrepreneurial process risk-taking, resource mobilization, and value creation are increasingly influenced by web-based platforms, AI systems, and sustainability requirements. The paper develops an emergent conceptual framework aligning technology progress and ecologically aware consideration into theoretical harmony and applied synergy regarding the development of entrepreneurship strategies to the globally integrated, AI-powered, connected economy.

Citation

Waheedha H. (2025). Redefining Entrepreneurship for the Digital and AI Era: A Systematic Theoretical Review and Conceptual Framework. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 8(6), 528-532; doi:10.56352/sei/8.6.56. https://imcra-az.org/archive/364-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-6-volviii-2025.html

Received: 13.12.2024 | Accepted: 05.05.2025 | Published: 01.06.2025 (available online)

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship has been the main catalyst of innovation, economic development, and intergenerational social mobility in the past (Lindquist & Vladasel, 2025; van Praag, 1999). Classical theory, particularly the one formulated under the influence of Joseph Schumpeter, highlighted entrepreneurs as innovators and "creative destruction" drivers in challenging existing economic frameworks and constructing new ones through risk-taking and innovation (Schumpeter, 1942, quoted in Tülüce & Yurtkur, 2015; Louçã, 2014).Classic entrepreneurial books put the entrepreneur in the position of identifying or uncovering opportunities, resources structured under uncertainty, and ventures engaged in (Berglund, 2005; van Praag, 1999). The twenty-first century has, however, seen the entrepreneurial landscape undergo a revolutionary shift driven by digitalization and artificial intelligence. Digital platforms have reorganized entrepreneurial activities by reducing barriers to entry, facilitating multi-sided market interaction, and unlocking opportunities for new value creation through participation in ecosystems (Zander et al., 2025; Tian et al., 2024). Digital entrepreneurship, based on platform-facilitated discovery, algorithmically driven orchestration, and predictive risk modeling, raises the question of the adequacy of past definitions that were based on mere individual intuition and firm-formation discrete (Wei et al., 2025; McMullen et al., 2024).

Correspondingly, AI technologies are revolutionizing entrepreneurial abilities by opening up information, enhancing competences, and reconfiguring forms of capital (Ganuthula, 2025). AI enables entrepreneurs to execute processes that previously required extensive organizational infrastructure, fundamentally transforming opportunity identification and scaling venture processes (Guerrero & Siegel, 2024; Ganuthula, 2025). The emergence of AI-fostered entrepreneurial events demands reconsideration of the conventional wisdom about innovation, risk, and opportunity within the study of entrepreneurship (Zander et al., 2025; Tian et al., 2024). Despite these technological developments, much of existing entrepreneurship theory remains based on Schumpeterian theories emphasizing human-driven innovation without properly recognizing platform economies, network ecosystems, or algorithmic improvements (Tülüce &

Yurtkur, 2015; Louçã, 2014; Guerrero & Siegel, 2024). Both flows of digital entrepreneurship and AI-empowered entrepreneurship have evolved essentially independently, giving rise to research that is often discontinuous from pre-existing theories (Wei et al., 2025; Tian et al., 2024). Consonantly, an emerging sense exists of the need for an encompassing, state-of-the-art conceptualisation of entrepreneurship combining legacy knowledge with recent digital and AI-driven developments. Especially, two core research questions underlie this theoretic study:

1. How has entrepreneurship changed because of digitalization and AI?

2. What are the most important characteristics to include in a remastered definition of entrepreneurship for the age of AI and digital?

This study seeks to provide answer to these questions by outlining two main contributions. First, it outlines a systematic theoretical synthesis through the integration of established theory of entrepreneurship and new insights from research on digital platforms, entrepreneurial ecosystems, and AI-enabled innovation (Zander et al., 2025; Guerrero & Siegel, 2024; Berglund, 2005). Second, it introduces a combined, updated definition of entrepreneurship that encompasses the main dimensions of entrepreneurial action in today's digitally networked and AI-magnified worlds.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Classical Entrepreneurship (1930s–1980s)

Classical entrepreneurship theory established the entrepreneur as a central agent of economic change through innovation, risk-taking, and opportunity discovery. Schumpeter (1934) described the entrepreneur as an innovator who shakes up by creating new combinations that revolutionize industries (Tülüce & Yurtkur, 2015; Louçã, 2014). Knight (1921) centered the entrepreneur as a bearer of real uncertainty, which is different from calculable risks (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). Kirzner (1979) on the other hand theorized the entrepreneur as being sensitive to arbitrage opportunity in imperfect markets and effecting market equilibration (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006).

Trait theories, and specifically McClelland's (1961) theory of achievement motivation, attempted to link entrepreneurial success with personal dispositions, although later criticized for simplifying complicated behavior (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Across these diverse classical paradigms, uncertainty was a theoretical anchor that connected variable entrepreneurial action thought (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). But early theories tended to toil in rigid disciplinary compartments of economics, psychology, sociology and failed to notice wider context factors such as institutions or technology (Audretsch & Belitski, 2021; Autio & Levie, 2017). That fragmentation spawned the creation of more dynamic, process-based models in subsequent decades.

2.2 Opportunity Recognition and Venture Creation (1980s–2000s)

It was in the 1980s and 1990s that opportunity-based and processual perspectives were increasingly highlighted in entrepreneurship studies. Shane and Venkataraman (2000) redefined entrepreneurship as the nexus between the existence of profitable opportunities and individuals able to recognize them and exploit them. Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) extended the framework by highlighting that entrepreneurship is opportunity-seeking regardless of current resource availability, with entrepreneurial activity being the center of focus rather than static characteristics (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). Gartner (1988) took things further by referring to entrepreneurship as the process involved in forming new ventures rather than a set of individual characteristics. It set opportunity discovery theorists, who hold that opportunities are out there in the world waiting to be discovered, against opportunity creation theorists, who argue the entrepreneur's ability to construct opportunities (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Sarasvathy, 2001). Resource-based theories, such as those of Amit et al. (1993), examined how venture success depends on marshaling and managing scarce resources innovatively. Shane and Venkataraman (2000) stressed opportunity heterogeneity and selection, and Sarasvathy's (2001) effectuation theory stressed iterative, means-driven entrepreneurial behavior. These theoretical advances notwithstanding, which helped further understand entrepreneurial behavior and cognition, fragmentation between conflicting paradigms continued (Gartner, 1988; Aldrich & Wiedenmayer, 1993).

2.3 Digital Entrepreneurship (2010s)

The digital technological innovations across the 2010s revolutionized entrepreneurial ventures on a fundamental level. Nambisan (2017) argued that digital infrastructure based on cloud computing, platforms, and big data redefined agency and entrepreneurial risk form and nature. Entrepreneurs started to use modular digital configurations in an effort to accelerate ideating, iterating, and scaling ventures (Nambisan, 2016; Giones & Brem, 2017).Autio et al. (2018) emphasized that ecosystems revolving around digital platforms offer new systems for venture formation, which contrast with traditional firm-based models.

Digital entrepreneurship infuses opportunity structures with technological affordances, enabling distributed innovation, resource orchestration, and real-time feedback (Nambisan et al., 2019). Scholars have pointed out that digital-native companies grow faster, pivot more frequently, and face new kinds of risk, including cybersecurity risks (Tang et al., 2025). Furthermore, Zander et al. (2025) argued that platform economies erase the differences between entrepreneurs, users, and other stake-

holders, challenging traditional theories based on stable market structures. In line with this, scholars claim to develop entrepreneurship theory further through the inclusion of digital innovation themes, ecosystem orchestration, and platform governance (Giones & Brem, 2017).

2.4 Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Sustainability

Later research on entrepreneurship has extended its focus to encompass environmental and systemic spheres. The entrepreneurial ecosystems model theorizes entrepreneurship as situated in networks of finance, institutions, culture, and infrastructure (Audretsch & Belitski, 2021; Autio & Levie, 2017). Effective ecosystems, where regulatory systems are favorable, possess cognitive legitimacy and relational trust, and enhance the provision and development of entrepreneurial firms (Spigel, 2017). On the other hand, institutional voids or poor supportive frameworks in ecosystems create the establishment of necessity entrepreneurship (Fossen et al., 2024).

At the same time, sustainable entrepreneurship has emerged as a necessary current, merging economic and social/ environmental objectives (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011). Business people increasingly establish businesses with a vision to address the consequences of climate change, scarcity, and inequality, and integrate business models with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011; Mariani et al., 2023). This shift defines entrepreneurship as merely a growth process to one of transformation and creating long-term value. Contemporary entrepreneurship theory more and more places entrepreneurial activity within dynamic social, environmental, and institutional systems rather than perceiving it as a discrete economic activity.

2.5 *Artificial Intelligence and Entrepreneurship Transformation*

Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming entrepreneurship drastically by embracing new business models and entrepreneurial strategies that challenge established theories. AI enhances decision-making, functioning, and innovation of entrepreneurial firms. Automation, machine learning, and data analysis are processes that enhance the optimization of resource utilization and strategic decisions (Almansour, 2023; Uriarte et al., 2025). Breaking barriers is one of the key value additions by AI. Small business start-up entrepreneurs are now able to utilize high-technology tools at relatively low costs so that they can compete on the same level as large companies. Predictive analytics and AI-enabled automation technologies have leveled the playing field for technology so that there is greater incorporation in entrepreneurship (Almansour, 2023; Uriarte et al., 2025). AI also creates digital entrepreneurship possibilities by combining learning and forecasting horizons through embracing them in it. It not just converges digital ecosystems, but it also allows entrepreneurs to forecast trends, personalize services, and innovate on the go as well. AI's unique role compared to earlier waves of digital transformation comes into perspective through this innovation (Obschonka et al., 2024).

However, researchers warn against giant pitfalls. Data-driven methods must be reconciled urgently with traditional, theory-driven research paradigms. Obschonka et al. (2024) suggest the "AI PEN" (Prospecting and Establishing Nexus) approach to cultivate academic rigor by embracing technology disruption.This would mean experimental AI discovery tempered by sound theory. Benefits listed in this new research include optimization of efficiency, flexibility, and product/service customization abilities. AI enables startups to automate processes, manage supply chains for efficiencies, and develop new products at an increasing pace (Almansour, 2023; Uriarte et al., 2025). However, there are also existential threats reported. Scholars speak of risks of algorithmic bias, ethical issues of intellectual property created by machines, and lack of human oversight over entrepreneurial choice (Uriarte et al., 2025). These risks require good governance and the creation of principles that reflect the balance between innovation and responsibility. Initial empirical studies are increasing, but research on AI and entrepreneurship is still in its early stages. Researchers are calling for systematic, theory-driven studies to advance knowledge and inform practice sufficiently (Obschonka et al., 2024; Uriarte et al., 2025). Overall, AI transforms entrepreneurship as an outsourced, tech-intensive process. It introduces non-human agency and intelligent learning abilities into business settings, forcing scholars and experts to adapt to this new phenomenon.

3. Methodology

The present study utilizes a systematic review of the theory to examine the evolution of entrepreneurship within the framework of digitalization and artificial intelligence (AI). Systematic searching of major scholarly databases, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, was conducted using combinations of keywords of "entrepreneurship theory," "digital entrepreneurship," "platform economy," "AI and entrepreneurship," and "sustainable entrepreneurship." Sources were filtered for scholarly merit, theoretical contribution, and usefulness, assigning first preference to peer-reviewed journal articles, classic theoretical contributions, and contemporary research on digitalization, AI innovation, and bringing sustainability together. Practitioner accounts and empirically grounded case studies lacking a conceptual foundation were excluded to provide theoretical homogeneity. A thematic synthesis approach was followed in organizing the selected literature into five overarching themes: classical entrepreneurship, opportunity-led entrepreneurship, digital entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial ecosystems, and AI-enhanced entrepreneurship. All sources were analyzed with respect to key entrepreneurial processes, including opportunity discovery, resource mobilization, risk control, and value creation. This

theory-driven, systematic method guarantees openness and provides a full foundation for developing an improved conceptual model of entrepreneurship suitable for the AI and digital era.

4. Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Framework Development

	Classical Era (1930s - 1980s)	Opportunity-Driven Era (1980s - 2000s)	Digital Era (2010s - 2020s)	AI-Augmented Era (2020s -Present)
Opportunity Recognition	Intuitive, individual	Discovery/creation based	Data-driven, real-time	Predictive analytics & AI models
Resource Mobilization	Tangible assets, local	Strategic recombination	Distributed platforms & services	Dynamic AI-matching & automation
Risk Management	Personal judgment	Strategic planning	Digital modeling	Algorithmic forecasting
Value Creation	Products/services	New venture creation	Platform-based ecosystems	Adaptive intelligent systems

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework: Evolution of Entrepreneurial Processes by Technological Eras

As Figure 1, Conceptual Framework: Evolution of Entrepreneurial Processes by Technological Eras, the theory of entrepreneurship has evolved via a sequence of successive periods within history, which each has been focused on differing combinations of innovation, uncertainty, opportunity, technology, and systemic context. The evolutionary process shows that entrepreneurial thinking processes and ideas have been enhanced and refined over time because of improvements in broader socio-economic as well as technological settings (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Figure 1 Conceptual Framework: Evolution of Entrepreneurial Processes by Technological Eras is explained in detail as follows:

4.1 Classical Entrepreneurship: Innovation, Uncertainty, and Value Creation

In the classical school of entrepreneurship theory (mid-20th century), the entrepreneur was largely seen as a solo innovator and risk-taker. Schumpeter (1934) depicted the entrepreneur as the "agent of creative destruction," who brings new combinations that break up old economic patterns (Tülüce & Yurtkur, 2015; Louçã, 2014). Knight (1921) indicated uncertainty-bearing as the entrepreneurial task of being one in which, instead of risking, entrepreneurs engage in the situation of actual uncertainty (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). Kirzner (1979), drawing on Austrian economics, stressed entrepreneurial responsiveness to market disequilibria and latent opportunities (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). In this phase, entrepreneurs operated in quite bounded, local markets and relied on personal judgment considerably. Resource mobilization was building physical inputs together, and risk management was primarily personal and instinctive (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Value creation centered on producing standalone products or services with clear economic usefulness.

4.2 Opportunity-Driven Entrepreneurship: Discovery, Creation, and Venture Formation

By the end of the 20th century, there was massive shift towards entrepreneurship as a process driven by opportunities. Shane and Venkataraman (2000) explained entrepreneurship as the point of intersection between the presence of profitable opportunities and the presence of individuals capable of taking advantage of them. Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) emphasized entrepreneurial action in terms of undertaking actions to pursue opportunities without concern for ownership of existing resources, whereas Gartner (1988) favored studying entrepreneurship as organizing new venture activities rather than linking it with individual attributes. Theoretical debates followed that distinguished opportunity creation from opportunity discovery. Alvarez and Barney (2007) argued that while discovery occurs when already present opportunities in the environment are discovered, theories of creation assert that entrepreneurs actually create opportunities through incremental behaviors. Sarasvathy (2001) advocated the effectuation theory, wherein entrepreneurs leveraged available means to co-create goals and opportunities in a contingent fashion.

Resource mobilization was channeled into recombination, for the entrepreneurs were now seen bringing and combining together and building up on resources (Amit et al., 1993). Risk management changed to emphasize systematic opportunity screening, market research, and strategic decision-making processes. Venture creation had now become an intended act of searching systemati-

cally for opportunities and getting organized for setting up new ventures (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

4.3 Digital Entrepreneurship: Platform Innovation and Ecosystem Orchestration

The arrival of digital technologies in the 2010s revolutionized entrepreneurial activities significantly. Nambisan (2017) asserted that digital infrastructures like cloud computing, platforms, big data has transformed entrepreneurial agency type to facilitate distributed innovation and scope of opportunity exploitation. Entrepreneurs no longer pooled physical assets but orchestrated distributed sets of assets, partners, and users (Giones & Brem, 2017; Nambisan et al., 2019).

Value creation had shifted away from independent products towards platform-guided ecosystem thinking, with the entrepreneur acting as a mediator in multi-sided interactions between different constituents (Nambisan, 2016; Autio et al., 2018). Mediation using digital signals and user-generated evidence had rendered opportunity recognition fast-forwarded and iterative. Resource mobilization extended to cloud-based services, open-source development, and global digital labor pools (Giones & Brem, 2017). Risk management grew to more often incorporate predictive analytics and scenario modeling supported by digital tools (Tang et al., 2025). This era witnessed a move away from firm-centric models towards ecosystem orchestration, with entrepreneurial success depending on navigating interdependent, technology-enabled networks (Zander et al., 2025).

4.4 AI-Augmented Entrepreneurship: Predictive Analytics and Algorithmic Decision-Making

The contemporary period of entrepreneurship reflects the rising involvement of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. Entrepreneurs increasingly apply machine learning, large-scale data analysis, and forecasting algorithms to identify, analyze, and exploit opportunity (Ganuthula, 2025; Fossen et al., 2024). Opportunity recognition is increasingly algorithmic rather than based on human intuition, as AI programs pinpoint emergent patterns beyond human sight (Obschonka et al., 2024). Resource mobilization gets algorithmically facilitated through real-time matching platforms that pair ventures with freelancers, cloud resources, or investors in real-time (Ganuthula, 2025). Risk management shifts towards computer-based forecasting models that produce simulations and make decisions in uncertain conditions (Fossen et al., 2024). According to Nambisan et al., 2019, Value creation often involves creating responsive intelligent ecosystems with the capacity for personalization of services and changing offerings over time .

This phase of AI enlarges entrepreneurial opportunity, facilitating anticipatory foresight, rapid growth, and venture automation. Rather than substituting conventional entrepreneurial rationalities, however, AI consolidates and increases traditional opportunity- and resource-based frameworks (Obschonka et al., 2024; Ganuthula, 2025).

4.5 Conceptual framework of Entrepreneurial Evolution

To complement these analyses, a conceptual framework is outlined, charting entrepreneurship development in four phases—classical, opportunity-oriented, digital, and AI-based—over four quintessential entrepreneurial activities: opportunity discovery, resource acquisition, risk anticipation, and value creation. As seen from Figure 1, all processes transform by way of these stages: intuitive discovery to predictive discovery (opportunity discovery), physical building to algorithmic arrangement (resource mobilization), personal risk-bearing to predictive modeling (risk management), and autonomous product innovation to adaptive ecosystem value generation (value creation). This model shows how technological innovations broaden entrepreneurial action, emphasizing that while technologies transform tools and structures, entrepreneurial logics of innovation, managing uncertainty, and capitalizing on opportunities are ageless (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006; Ganuthula, 2025).

This conceptual framework *Figure 1: Evolution of Entrepreneurial Processes by Technological Eras,* illustrates the development of key entrepreneurial processes: opportunity discovery, resource mobilization, risk assessment, and value creation through four general phases: Classical Entrepreneurship, Opportunity-driven Entrepreneurship, Digital Entrepreneurship, and AI-Augmented Entrepreneurship.

5. Discussion

5.1 Evolution of Entrepreneurship: Classical to AI-Augmented

Our theoretical journey reveals the evolution of entrepreneurship across historical time. In the classical period, entrepreneurs were portrayed as innovators who introduce alterations into existing economic regimes through "creative destruction" by recombining scarce resources (Schumpeter, 1934; McMullen & Shepherd, 2006; Tülüce & Yurtkur, 2015; Louçã, 2014). Early theories portrayed entrepreneurship as being judgmental resource allocation in a state of uncertainty (Knight, 1921; McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). Carrying on through to the era of opportunity, authors such as Stevenson and Jarillo (1990), Shane and Venkataraman (2000), and Gartner (1988) highlight increasingly the entrepreneur's role in discovering, researching, and developing market opportunities, driving entrepreneurship from invention to planned venture creation.

The digital age pushed entrepreneurship to the horizons of platform-based innovation and ecosystem orchestration. Digital infrastructures—open platforms, big data analytics, and cloud computing—defined entrepreneurial activity by decentralizing opportunity discovery and enabling instant mobilization of resources (Giones & Brem, 2017; Autio et al., 2018; Nambisan et al., 2019).Latest to join the fray have been artificial intelligence (AI) technologies that introduced predictive opportunity detection, intelligent resource coordination, and algorithmic decision-making, thus introducing AI-based entrepreneurship (Ganuthula, 2025; Fossen et al., 2024; Obschonka et al., 2024). Side by side with technological advancements has

also come the prominence of sustainable entrepreneurship, correlating venture creation with environmental and social goals (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011; George et al., 2021).

5.2 Proposed Integrated Definition

Pursuing this synthesis, we recommend the following new definition:

"Entrepreneurship is the activity of discovering and leveraging opportunities for value creation, business model redefinition, and innovation through deliberate management of resources, leveraging digital platforms and AI-driven decision-making, and fostering sustainable socio-economic development on a global scale."

It reconciles classic factors—opportunity identification, innovation, managing uncertainty—with contemporary requirements like digitalization, platform economy, predictive analytics, and sustainability.It captures the broader focus and complexity of entrepreneurship in the connected world of today.

5.3 Theoretical Contributions

The reconceptualization serves entrepreneurship theory in several ways. It, for the first time, situates classic innovation and resource orchestration theories in digital and AI-supported contexts (Giones & Brem, 2017; McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). Entrepreneurs no longer make decisions based on personal intuition; now they are more dependent on algorithmic vision, data-driven decisions, and platform-facilitated collaboration (Autio et al., 2018; Nambisan et al., 2019). Second, it bridges entrepreneurship theory with platform economy scholarship since entrepreneurial prospects and value co-creation often emerge in changing multi-sided systems (Nambisan, 2016; Zander et al., 2025). Third, through having sustainability built in explicitly, the model expands entrepreneurship from economic results to social and environmental outcomes, in harmony with international development agendas (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011; George et al., 2021).

5.4 Practical Implications

For entrepreneurs, this model focuses on digital fluency and data-driven decision-making. Firms must integrate digital platforms, AI tools, and sustainability practices more deeply into business models (Ganuthula, 2025; Obschonka et al., 2024). Entrepreneurs must employ predictive analytics for opportunity recognition, platform infrastructures for mobilizing resources, and embed ecological and social considerations into value propositions (Nambisan et al., 2019; George et al., 2021). For educators, entrepreneurship education curricula must shift to include fundamental digital technology skills, platform business models, and sustainability principles. Training courses must prepare students not only to detect opportunities but also to manage AI-based systems and position businesses against broader societal purposes (Autio & Levie, 2017). For policy-makers, the model suggests that entrepreneurship can be developed through investments in digital infrastructure, AI literacy, and green innovation systems. Digital access policies, sustainable start-up policies, and AI integration policies can allow entrepreneurs to thrive in emerging economies (Audretsch & Belitski, 2021; George et al., 2021).

5.5 Limitations

This is theoretical research and combines earlier theoretical trends in a nonempirical setting. While it includes digitalization, AI, and sustainability within one framework of entrepreneurship, the model remains theoretical. In light of comments made by Obschonka et al. (2024) and Ganuthula (2025), empirical research needs to be undertaken to measure the capacity of these combined dimensions to explain entrepreneurial dynamics of the day in its entirety.

5.6 Future Research Directions

Empirical confirmation of the proposed definition across different contexts is left to future research. As an example, survey or Delphi surveys may measure whether entrepreneurs recognize digitalization and sustainability as key characteristics of entrepreneurship. Testing whether AI implementation influences venture development compared to traditional decision models (Fossen et al., 2024) is an area of additional research.

Further research can also examine how platform governance arrangements influence entrepreneurial potential across ecosystems (Zander et al., 2025). Finally, longitudinal case studies could examine how digital and sustainable entrepreneurship models evolve over time across geographies and industries (George et al., 2021).

6. Conclusion

Entrepreneurship has historically been the moving force of innovation, economic progress, and societal change (Schumpeter, 1934; McMullen & Shepherd, 2006; Lindquist & Vladasel, 2025). As our rigorous theoretical review indicates, however, traditional notions based on single innovation, chance discovery, and managing uncertainty do not suffice to account for the advanced aspects of the digital and AI era (Giones & Brem, 2017; Fossen et al., 2024).

Our analysis identifies an evolutionary transition from classic models of entrepreneurial action to contemporary paradigms including digital platform orchestration, opportunity sensing through predictability, and value creation within ecosystems (Nambisan et al., 2019; Zander et al., 2025). The confluence of AI technologies remaps entrepreneurial decision-making procedures, facilitating algorithmic foresight and autonomous mobilization of resources (Ganuthula, 2025; Obschonka et al., 2024), while sustainability needs place entrepreneurship as a function of addressing broader socio-environmental challenges (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011; George et al., 2021).

Based on these findings, this research recommends a revised definition:

Entrepreneurship is the practice of discovering and seizing opportunities in value creation, altering business processes, and creating innovation with strategic management of resources, leveraging digital platforms, and decision-making with AI, as well as developing sustainable socio-economic development at a global level.

While this syncretic definition sophisticates the theory of entrepreneurship with the confluence of past and futurist thought, it is one of concept. Empirical research in the future will need to explore how entrepreneurs syncretize platform strategy, sustainability ambitions, and AI potential by industry and context. With increasingly dynamic technological and social evolution, more sophisticated entrepreneur definition is needed to enable innovation, human-centric advancement, and sustainable value creation.

References

1. Almansour, M. (2022). Artificial intelligence and resource optimization: A study of Fintech start-ups. *Resources Policy, 79*, 103250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2022.103250
2. Aldrich, H. E., & Wiedenmayer, G. (1993). From traits to rates: An ecological perspective on organizational foundings. In J. A. Katz & R. H. Brockhaus (Eds.), *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth* (Vol. 1, pp. 145–195). JAI Press.
3. Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2007). Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 1*(1–2), 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.4
4. Amit, R., Glosten, L., & Muller, E. (1993). Challenges to theory development in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Management Studies, 30*(5), 815–834. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1993.tb00327.x
5. Audretsch, D. B., & Belitski, M. (2021). Towards an entrepreneurial ecosystem typology for regional economic development: The role of creative class and entrepreneurship. *Regional Studies, 55*(4), 735–756. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2020.1854711
6. Autio, E., & Levie, J. (2017). Management of entrepreneurial ecosystems. In G. Ahmetoglu, T. Chamorro-Premuzic, B. Klinger, & T. Karcisky (Eds.), *The Wiley Handbook of Entrepreneurship* (Chapter 19). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118970812.ch19
7. Berglund, H. (2005). *Toward a theory of entrepreneurial action: Exploring risk, opportunity and self in technology entrepreneurship* [Doctoral dissertation, Chalmers University of Technology]. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237713477
8. Bigliardi, B., Dolci, V., Filippelli, S., Petroni, A., & Pini, B. (2025). The role of digitalization in startups: A keyword-based literature review. *Procedia Computer Science, 253*, 2665–2673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2025.01.326
9. Csaszar, F. A., Ketkar, H., & Kim, H. (2024). Artificial intelligence and strategic decision-making: Evidence from entrepreneurs and investors. *Strategy Science.* (Forthcoming). https://doi.org/10.1287/stsc.2024.XXXX
10. Donaldson, C., Peiró Signes, Á., & Villagrasa, J. (2025). Is the road to high growth paved with intrapreneurial intention? The role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and digital skills on entrepreneurship intention types. *The International Journal of Management Education, 23*, 101174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2025.101174
11. Farrell, M., Skorodziyevskiy, V., & Willis, C. H. (2025). Analytic induction: A novel approach in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 23*, e00527. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2025.e00527
12. Fossen, F. M., McLemore, T., & Sorgner, A. (2024). Artificial intelligence and entrepreneurship (IZA Discussion Paper No. 17055). *Institute of Labor Economics (IZA).* https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/17055
13. Fraccastoro, S., Vanninen, H., & Gabrielsson, M. (2025). Two decades of research on digitalization, entrepreneurship, and internationalization: What foundations do they provide for research on digital entrepreneurial internationalization? *International Business Review.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2025.102455
14. Ganuthula, V. R. R. (2025). The solo revolution: A theory of AI-enabled individual entrepreneurship [Preprint]. *arXiv.* https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2502.00009
15. Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business, 12*(4), 11–32.
16. George, G., Merrill, R. K., & Schillebeeckx, S. J. D. (2021). Digital sustainability and entrepreneurship: How digital innovations are helping tackle climate change and sustainable development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 45*(5), 999–1027. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719899425
17. Giones, F., & Brem, A. (2017). Digital technology entrepreneurship: A definition and research agenda. *Technology Innovation Management Review, 7*(5), 44–51. https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/1076
18. Guerrero, M., & Siegel, D. S. (2024). Schumpeter meets Teece: Proposed metrics for assessing entrepreneurial innovation and dynamic capabilities in entrepreneurial ecosystems in an emerging economy. *Research Policy, 53*, 104984. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2024.104984
19. Huang, Y., Li, P., Bu, Y., & Zhao, G. (2023). What entrepreneurial ecosystem elements promote sustainable entrepreneurship? *Journal of Cleaner Production, 422*, 138459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.138459
20. Jung, Y., & Pawlowski, S. (2015). The meaning of virtual entrepreneurship in social virtual worlds. *Telematics and Informatics, 32*(2), 193–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2014.07.002
21. Lindquist, M. J., & Vladasel, T. (2025). Are entrepreneurs more upwardly mobile? *Journal of Business Venturing, 40*, 106498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2025.106498

22. Loucã, F. (2014). The elusive concept of innovation for Schumpeter, Marschak and the early econometricians. *Research Policy, 43*(8), 1442–1449. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.02.002
23. Mariani, M. M., Machado, I., & Nambisan, S. (2023). Types of innovation and artificial intelligence: A systematic quantitative literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research, 155*, 113364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113364
24. McMullen, J. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(1), 132–152. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379628
25. McMullen, J. S., Fitzsimmons, J. R., Shetty, K., & Ramoglou, S. (2024). A temporal typology of entrepreneurial opportunities: Implications for the optimal timing of entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing, 39*, 106356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2023.106356
26. Miah, M. T., Aiupova, N., Erdei-Gally, S., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2025). Digital entrepreneurship ecosystems: Then vs. now—a future perspectives. *Digital Business, 5*, 100110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.digbus.2025.100110
27. Nambisan, S. (2016). Digital entrepreneurship: Toward a digital technology perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41*(6), 1029–1055. https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12254
28. Nambisan, S., Wright, M., & Feldman, M. (2019). The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship: Progress, challenges and key themes. *Research Policy, 48*(8), 103773. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.018
29. Obschonka, M., Grégoire, D. A., Nikolaev, B., Ooms, F., Lévesque, M., Pollack, J. M., & Behrend, T. S. (2024). Artificial intelligence and entrepreneurship: A call for research to prospect and establish the scholarly AI frontiers. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 49*(3), 620–641. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587241304676
30. Relente, A. R. R., & Capistrano, E. P. S. (2025). Innovation self-efficacy, theory of planned behavior, and entrepreneurial intentions: The perspective of young Filipinos. *Asia Pacific Management Review, 30*, 100350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2024.100350
31. Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 243–263. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378020
32. Schaltegger, S., & Wagner, M. (2011). Sustainable entrepreneurship and sustainability innovation: Categories and interactions. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 20*(4), 222–237. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.682
33. Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 217–226. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.2791611
34. Stevenson, H. H., & Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal, 11*(Special Issue: Corporate Entrepreneurship), 17–27. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2486667
35. Spigel, B. (2017). The relational organization of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41*(1), 49–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12167
36. Tang, X., Du, S., & Deng, W. (2025). Business innovation in digital startups: A case study of an AI startup. *International Review of Economics and Finance, 98*, 103898. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2025.103898
37. Tian, S., Sharma, A., Wu, L., & Pawar, K. S. (2024). A systematic literature review on the digital platform and its role in the circular economy: State-of-the-art and future research directions. *Journal of Digital Economy, 3*, 132–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdec.2024.12.001
38. Tülüce, N. S., & Koç Yurtkur, A. (2015). Term of strategic entrepreneurship and Schumpeter's creative destruction theory. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 207*, 720–728. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.146
39. Uriarte, S., Baier-Fuentes, H., Espinoza-Benavides, J., & Inzunza-Mendoza, W. (2025). Artificial intelligence technologies and entrepreneurship: A hybrid literature review. *Review of Managerial Science.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-025-00839-4
40. Van Praag, M. (1999). Some classic views on entrepreneurship. *De Economist, 147*(3), 311–335. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003749128457
41. Wang, T., Libaers, D., Yang, X., & Hu, L. (2025). Publishing top entrepreneurship research: A dilemma for entrepreneurship scholars. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 23*, e00523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2025.e00523
42. Wei, C.-P., Fang, E. S.-H., Yang, C.-S., & Liu, P.-J. (2025). To shine or not to shine: Startup success prediction by exploiting technological and venture-capital-related features. *Information & Management, 62*, 104152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2025.104152
43. Zander, U., Lu, L., & Chimenti, G. (2025). The platform economy and futures of market societies: Salient tensions in ecosystem evolution. *Journal of Business Research, 189*, 115037. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.115037