

ISIR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISIRJAHSS)
ISSN: 3048-7463 (Online)
Frequency: Bimonthly
Published By ISIR Publisher
Journal Homepage Link- https://isirpublisher.com/index.php/isirjahss

Family and Social Determinants of Entrepreneurship: Communication, Achievement Motivation, Self-Esteem and Entrepreneurial Success

By

Wojciech Słomski

Abstract

This article analyses the family and social determinants of entrepreneurship, with particular emphasis on communication, achievement motivation, self-esteem and entrepreneurial success. Its central thesis is that entrepreneurship cannot be adequately understood as an isolated act of individual initiative or as a purely economic response to market opportunity. Rather, entrepreneurship should be interpreted as a socially embedded, psychosocially mediated and ethically conditioned form of agency. Entrepreneurial success is shaped by family communication, self-esteem, achievement motivation, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, socioeconomic factors, knowledge management, innovativeness, ethical responsibility, governance, corruption levels, sustainable growth and digital communication.

The article integrates classical theories of entrepreneurship, knowledge management, innovation and governance with contemporary empirical studies by Marcin W. Staniewski and his co-authors. Particular attention is given to the influence of socioeconomic factors on the entrepreneurship of Polish students, the mediating role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy in the relationship between family communication and entrepreneurial success, the mediating role of self-esteem and achievement motivation in family determinants of entrepreneurial success, human resource management as a factor of innovativeness, knowledge management as a transition from concept to practice, ethical aspects of entrepreneurship, corruption and domestic savings, consumer value creation through WhatsApp use, and the relationship between innovation, management and governance in sustainable growth.

The first part presents entrepreneurship as a socially embedded form of agency. The second part analyses family communication as a formative determinant of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. The third part discusses achievement motivation and self-esteem as mediating factors of entrepreneurial success. The fourth part situates entrepreneurship within socioeconomic and educational contexts. The fifth part examines knowledge management and innovativeness as organizational conditions of success. The sixth part analyses ethics, governance and corruption as institutional determinants of entrepreneurship. The seventh part considers digital communication as a contemporary space of value creation. The article concludes that entrepreneurial success should be understood as the outcome of an integrated process involving family, society, psychology, organization, ethics and governance.

Keywords: *entrepreneurship; family communication; achievement motivation; self-esteem; entrepreneurial self-efficacy; entrepreneurial success; socioeconomic factors; knowledge management; innovation; ethics; governance.*

Article History

Received: 05/03/2026
Accepted: 15/04/2026
Published: 09/05/2026

Vol – 3 Issue –3

PP: -31-39

Introduction

Entrepreneurship is one of the central categories of contemporary economic and management studies. It is associated with innovation, opportunity recognition, risk-taking, value creation and economic development. However, entrepreneurship cannot be reduced to market behaviour or individual ambition. It is formed within families, educational institutions, social environments, organizations and governance systems. The entrepreneur is not an abstract economic actor but a person whose agency is shaped by

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski** .

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

communication, self-esteem, achievement motivation, knowledge, social expectations and institutional trust.

Classical theories remain indispensable for understanding entrepreneurship. Schumpeter interpreted the entrepreneur as the agent of new combinations and creative destruction, emphasizing innovation as the dynamic force of economic development (Schumpeter, 1934). Drucker later understood innovation and entrepreneurship as disciplined practices that can be learned and managed (Drucker, 1985). Knight connected entrepreneurship with uncertainty and risk, while Kirzner emphasized alertness to opportunities (Knight, 1921; Kirzner, 1973). These theories explain why entrepreneurship matters for economic change, but they do not fully explain how entrepreneurial agency is socially and psychologically formed.

The family and social determinants of entrepreneurship therefore require systematic attention. Family communication shapes the individual's sense of agency, confidence, responsibility and attitude toward failure. Social conditions influence the feasibility and attractiveness of entrepreneurial action. Educational institutions provide knowledge and models of professional identity. Organizations transform individual initiative into collective innovation. Governance systems determine whether entrepreneurship is rewarded as productive, ethical and sustainable or redirected toward opportunism and rent-seeking.

The empirical studies by Staniewski and his co-authors provide a strong foundation for this integrated interpretation. Staniewski and Szopiński show that socioeconomic factors influence the entrepreneurship of Polish students, demonstrating that entrepreneurial attitudes are shaped by social and economic conditions rather than by individual traits alone (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). This is crucial because it situates entrepreneurship within broader structures of opportunity, education, family background and perceived feasibility.

At the family level, Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski demonstrate that family communication influences entrepreneurial success through the mediating role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Staniewski et al., 2025). This means that communication patterns within the family help shape the entrepreneur's belief in his or her capacity to perform entrepreneurial tasks. In a related study, the same authors show that family determinants of entrepreneurial success operate through self-esteem and achievement motivation (Staniewski et al., 2024). These findings indicate that entrepreneurial success is not only an external economic result but also the outcome of psychological and relational formation.

The organizational dimension is equally important. Staniewski's work on knowledge management, from concept to practice, shows that knowledge becomes valuable only when it is translated into action, routines and organizational capability (Staniewski, 2002). His article on human resource management in the aspect of innovativeness demonstrates that innovation depends on people and on the organizational practices that activate human creativity and commitment (Staniewski, 2011). Entrepreneurial success therefore requires not only family support and motivation but also knowledge, learning and organizational innovation.

The ethical and institutional dimensions complete the model. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk argue that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects because economic action affects persons, communities and institutions (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Entrepreneurship without ethics may generate profit but destroy trust and legitimacy. Abu and Staniewski's empirical study of corruption and domestic savings in Nigeria shows that corruption has measurable economic consequences and weakens development conditions (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). Governance is therefore not external to entrepreneurship; it is one of its necessary conditions. This broader perspective corresponds to Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski's argument that sustainable growth requires the integration of innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022).

Finally, contemporary entrepreneurship increasingly unfolds within digital communication environments. Cruz-Cárdenas, Guadalupe-Lanas, Zabelina, Palacio-Fierro, Velín-Fárez and Staniewski show that consumer value creation through WhatsApp use involves relational, emotional, functional and social dimensions (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). This finding widens the meaning of communication in entrepreneurship. Communication is not only a family or organizational factor; it is also a digital space in which consumers, entrepreneurs and communities co-create value.

The aim of this article is to analyse family and social determinants of entrepreneurship through the categories of communication, achievement motivation, self-esteem and entrepreneurial success. The article argues that entrepreneurial success emerges from the interaction between psychosocial formation, socioeconomic opportunity, knowledge management, innovativeness, ethics, governance and communication.

Entrepreneurship as Socially Embedded Agency

Entrepreneurship is often presented as an act of individual courage, creativity and initiative. Such a view is not false, but it remains incomplete. Entrepreneurship is always socially embedded. The entrepreneur acts within a network of family expectations, educational opportunities, social norms, institutional rules, market conditions and cultural meanings. Even the most individual entrepreneurial decision is shaped by a field of social conditions.

Schumpeter's theory of entrepreneurship as innovation and creative destruction highlights the transformative function of the entrepreneur (Schumpeter, 1934). Drucker's view of innovation and entrepreneurship as disciplined practices emphasizes that entrepreneurship can be learned and systematically developed (Drucker, 1985). Kirzner's concept of alertness shows how entrepreneurs perceive opportunities

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski** .
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

that others miss (Kirzner, 1973). Yet the ability to perceive and act upon opportunity depends on more than individual alertness. It depends on education, confidence, knowledge, networks and institutional feasibility.

This is why Staniewski and Szopiński's study of Polish students is especially important. They show that socioeconomic factors influence the entrepreneurship of Polish students, indicating that entrepreneurial attitudes are socially conditioned (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). Students' entrepreneurial intentions are shaped by perceived economic opportunity, family resources, educational context and expectations about the labour market. Entrepreneurship therefore appears not as an isolated psychological disposition but as a form of socially situated agency.

Shapero and Sokol's theory of entrepreneurial events provides a useful conceptual framework for this claim. Entrepreneurial action depends on perceived desirability, perceived feasibility and propensity to act (Shapero and Sokol, 1982). Socioeconomic conditions affect all three. If entrepreneurship is socially valued but perceived as practically inaccessible, intention may remain weak. If it is feasible but culturally discouraged or institutionally risky, individuals may avoid it. Staniewski and Szopiński's findings demonstrate that the social environment shapes the way young people interpret entrepreneurial possibilities (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013).

The social embeddedness of entrepreneurship is also visible in Baumol's distinction between productive, unproductive and destructive entrepreneurship (Baumol, 1990). Entrepreneurial energy exists in many societies, but institutions and incentives determine its direction. Where rules reward innovation, cooperation and productive work, entrepreneurship contributes to development. Where rules reward manipulation, rent-seeking or corruption, entrepreneurship may become socially harmful. This means that entrepreneurship must be analysed together with ethics and governance.

The resource-based view of the firm also supports this broader interpretation. Barney argues that sustainable competitive advantage depends on resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (Barney, 1991). For entrepreneurs, such resources include not only capital and technology but also family support, self-esteem, self-efficacy, social networks, knowledge, trust and ethical reputation. Penrose's theory of the growth of the firm similarly emphasizes the importance of internal resources and managerial knowledge (Penrose, 1959). Entrepreneurial success is therefore not only a function of market opportunity but also of the resources that individuals and organizations can mobilize.

Social embeddedness also implies that entrepreneurship education must be interdisciplinary. It should include not only business planning and financial calculation but also communication, ethics, self-efficacy, knowledge management, innovation, institutional literacy and sustainability. Entrepreneurship is not only about starting firms; it is about forming responsible economic agency.

Thus, entrepreneurship should be understood as socially embedded agency. It is individual action, but action formed by family, society, institutions and knowledge. It is economic action, but action with ethical and social consequences. It is innovative action, but innovation depends on communication, learning and trust.

Family Communication and Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy

Family communication is one of the most important formative determinants of entrepreneurship. The family is the first environment in which individuals learn trust, autonomy, responsibility, cooperation, attitudes toward work and interpretations of success and failure. It shapes how individuals understand themselves as agents capable of action. For this reason, family communication should be treated not as a private background variable but as a structural component of entrepreneurial formation.

Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski demonstrate that family communication influences entrepreneurial success through entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Staniewski et al., 2025). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy refers to the belief that one can successfully perform entrepreneurial tasks such as recognizing opportunities, solving problems, mobilizing resources and managing uncertainty. The mediating role of self-efficacy means that family communication becomes economically relevant because it shapes the entrepreneur's perceived capacity for action.

Supportive family communication can encourage autonomy, initiative and resilience. It can help individuals interpret uncertainty not as paralysis but as a challenge. Destructive communication, by contrast, may weaken confidence, produce fear of failure and reduce willingness to take initiative. Since entrepreneurship requires action under uncertainty, the family's communicative climate becomes one of the psychological foundations of entrepreneurial agency.

The importance of self-efficacy connects with classical entrepreneurship theory. Kirzner emphasizes alertness to opportunity, but opportunity recognition is insufficient if the individual does not believe that action is possible (Kirzner, 1973). Drucker treats entrepreneurship as disciplined innovation, but discipline requires confidence that learning and systematic action can produce results (Drucker, 1985). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy therefore links perception with action.

Staniewski et al.'s study is significant because it shows that self-efficacy is not merely an individual trait but a relationally formed capacity (Staniewski et al., 2025). It arises partly through communication, feedback, support and expectations. This means that the family participates in the formation of entrepreneurial agency even before formal education or market experience.

Family communication also shapes attitudes toward failure. Entrepreneurship inevitably involves failure, experimentation and revision. Families that interpret failure as shame may discourage risk-taking. Families that interpret failure as

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Slomski** .
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

learning may strengthen resilience. In innovation theory, the ability to learn from failure is central. Christensen's analysis of disruptive innovation shows that established firms often fail because they cannot interpret change correctly (Christensen, 1997). At the personal level, entrepreneurs may fail to innovate if they cannot interpret setbacks constructively.

Communication also carries ethical content. Families communicate not only confidence but also values: honesty, responsibility, fairness, respect and attitudes toward others. This connects family communication with the ethical aspects of entrepreneurship. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk's analysis shows that entrepreneurship must be interpreted ethically because it affects persons and institutions (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). If family communication forms responsibility, it contributes to ethical entrepreneurship.

Thus, family communication is both psychological and moral. It shapes self-efficacy and values. It forms the individual's capacity to act and the direction of that action. Entrepreneurship begins not only in markets but in communicative environments where individuals learn whether they can act, how they should act and what success means.

Achievement Motivation and Self-Esteem as Mediators of Entrepreneurial Success

Achievement motivation and self-esteem are central psychosocial determinants of entrepreneurial success. Achievement motivation directs individuals toward goals, effort and performance, while self-esteem provides psychological stability and a sense of personal worth. Together, they help explain why some individuals persist in entrepreneurial activity despite uncertainty, difficulty and failure.

Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski show that family determinants influence entrepreneurial success through self-esteem and achievement motivation (Staniewski et al., 2024). This finding is important because it reveals the mediating structure of entrepreneurial success. Family does not determine success mechanically. Rather, family factors shape psychological resources, and these resources influence entrepreneurial behaviour. Entrepreneurial success is therefore a mediated phenomenon.

McClelland's theory of achievement motivation provides a classic framework for this analysis. McClelland argues that individuals with a strong need for achievement prefer challenging tasks, seek feedback and take responsibility for outcomes (McClelland, 1961). Entrepreneurship offers precisely such conditions. Entrepreneurs face uncertainty, make decisions, receive market feedback and are responsible for results. However, Staniewski et al. add an important relational dimension: achievement motivation is shaped by family determinants and operates together with self-esteem (Staniewski et al., 2024).

Self-esteem is especially important because entrepreneurship exposes individuals to criticism, failure and instability. A person with weak self-esteem may interpret business failure as personal defeat. A person with stable self-esteem may interpret failure as feedback. This distinction affects resilience. Entrepreneurs must be able to continue learning and acting despite setbacks. Self-esteem therefore supports the continuity of entrepreneurial agency.

Achievement motivation provides direction. It transforms general confidence into goal-oriented effort. Without achievement motivation, self-esteem may remain passive. Without self-esteem, achievement motivation may become fragile or defensive. Together, they form a psychological structure that supports entrepreneurial action. Staniewski et al.'s findings show that these variables are essential for understanding entrepreneurial success (Staniewski et al., 2024).

The link between achievement motivation, self-esteem and ethics should also be emphasized. Achievement motivation may lead to excellence, but without ethical direction it can become excessive competition, exploitation or domination. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk remind us that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects and must be evaluated according to responsibility and social consequences (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Therefore, achievement motivation should be integrated with moral formation.

Self-esteem also influences leadership. Entrepreneurs often become founders and managers. Their self-esteem shapes how they respond to criticism, delegate tasks, manage conflict and relate to employees. Low self-esteem may produce defensive management or excessive control. Stable self-esteem may support openness, trust and learning. This links psychosocial determinants with organizational culture.

The resource-based view provides another perspective. Psychological resources such as self-esteem and achievement motivation may function as intangible resources that support entrepreneurial performance. Barney's theory suggests that sustained advantage depends on resources that are difficult to imitate (Barney, 1991). Psychological resilience, family-supported motivation and ethical credibility are not easily copied. They may become deep foundations of entrepreneurial success.

Thus, achievement motivation and self-esteem should not be treated as secondary psychological variables. They are central mediators between family determinants and entrepreneurial success. They explain how family and social experiences become economic agency.

Socioeconomic Conditions and the Social Formation of Entrepreneurial Opportunity

Entrepreneurial success depends not only on family communication and psychological resources but also on socioeconomic conditions. Opportunity is never purely objective. It is perceived, interpreted and evaluated by individuals situated in specific social and economic contexts. Socioeconomic conditions shape whether entrepreneurship appears desirable, feasible and legitimate.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski** .
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Staniewski and Szopiński's research on Polish students shows that socioeconomic factors influence entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). This finding is important because students represent a social group at the threshold of professional life. Their entrepreneurial choices are shaped by education, family background, labour-market expectations and access to resources. Entrepreneurship appears differently to students depending on whether they perceive the economic environment as open, supportive and fair.

The concept of perceived feasibility is central here. Shapero and Sokol argue that entrepreneurial action depends on perceived desirability and perceived feasibility (Shapero and Sokol, 1982). Socioeconomic conditions affect both. If individuals believe that entrepreneurship is a respected and realistic path, they may be more willing to act. If they believe that it requires inaccessible capital, privileged networks or tolerance of corruption, they may withdraw.

The socioeconomic dimension also explains why entrepreneurship education must address social inequality. Students from families with entrepreneurial experience, financial stability or strong networks may possess advantages that others lack. Family capital, self-esteem and self-efficacy may be unevenly distributed. Entrepreneurship policy must therefore avoid assuming that all individuals begin from the same starting point. Staniewski and Szopiński's findings support a more realistic and socially sensitive approach to entrepreneurship education (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013).

Governance and corruption also shape socioeconomic opportunity. Abu and Staniewski show that corruption affects domestic savings and weakens development conditions (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). In corrupt environments, individuals may perceive entrepreneurship as dependent on informal access rather than productive effort. This discourages ethical entrepreneurship and may redirect entrepreneurial energy toward unproductive strategies. Thus, socioeconomic determinants cannot be separated from institutional integrity.

Baumol's theory helps interpret this relationship. Institutions determine whether entrepreneurship becomes productive, unproductive or destructive (Baumol, 1990). Socioeconomic conditions do not merely influence the quantity of entrepreneurship; they influence its quality. Societies that reward innovation and responsibility generate different entrepreneurial behaviour than societies that reward manipulation and rent-seeking.

Socioeconomic opportunity also connects with knowledge and innovation. Individuals with access to education, networks and digital tools are better able to transform ideas into ventures. Cohen and Levinthal's concept of absorptive capacity suggests that prior knowledge influences the ability to recognize and use external knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). At the individual level, socioeconomic conditions shape access to such prior knowledge.

Thus, entrepreneurship is socially formed. Opportunity exists, but it must be perceived as meaningful and feasible. Family communication, self-esteem and achievement motivation shape the internal capacity to act, while socioeconomic conditions shape the external field of action. Entrepreneurial success emerges where these dimensions converge.

Knowledge Management, Human Resources and Innovativeness

Family and social determinants explain how entrepreneurial agency is formed, but entrepreneurial success also requires organizational capability. Entrepreneurs must transform ideas into ventures, knowledge into action and individual motivation into collective performance. This is where knowledge management, human resource management and innovativeness become central.

Staniewski's article *Zarządzanie wiedzą: od koncepcji do praktyki działania* presents knowledge management as the transition from concept to practical organizational action (Staniewski, 2002). This is essential for entrepreneurship because entrepreneurial success depends on the ability to interpret information, learn from experience and implement knowledge in real contexts. Knowledge that remains theoretical does not create entrepreneurial value. It must become practice.

This view corresponds to Davenport and Prusak's concept of working knowledge as a combination of experience, values, contextual information and expert insight (Davenport and Prusak, 1998). Nonaka and Takeuchi's theory of knowledge creation similarly emphasizes the interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). Entrepreneurs must convert tacit insights into communicable strategies and transform explicit knowledge into practical capability.

Staniewski's knowledge-management perspective is especially relevant because it connects cognition with action (Staniewski, 2002). Entrepreneurial success requires not only knowing what the market needs but also knowing how to organize, communicate and implement solutions. Knowledge management creates the cognitive infrastructure of entrepreneurship.

Human resource management provides the human infrastructure. Staniewski's article on human resource management in the aspect of innovativeness argues that people are central to the innovative capacity of enterprises (Staniewski, 2011). Employees carry tacit knowledge, creativity and practical experience. Innovation therefore depends on how people are recruited, motivated, trained, empowered and organized.

This argument is supported by Pfeffer's claim that competitive advantage can be built through people, Huselid's evidence that HR practices affect performance, and Becker, Huselid and Ulrich's strategic HR scorecard approach (Pfeffer, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Becker, Huselid and Ulrich, 2001). For entrepreneurial firms, HRM is not a later administrative function. It is part of the early formation of organizational capability.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Slomski** .
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Innovation theory reinforces this connection. Abernathy and Clark show that innovation can reshape competencies, while Henderson and Clark demonstrate that architectural innovation may disrupt organizations even when technologies appear familiar (Abernathy and Clark, 1985; Henderson and Clark, 1990). Christensen shows that firms may fail because they cannot interpret disruptive change (Christensen, 1997). These theories indicate that innovation depends on learning, interpretation and organizational flexibility.

Staniewski's works on knowledge management and HRM should therefore be read together: knowledge management explains how organizations learn, while HRM explains how people become agents of innovation (Staniewski, 2002; Staniewski, 2011). Entrepreneurial success requires both. A firm that possesses knowledge but cannot mobilize people will not innovate. A firm that has motivated people but lacks knowledge systems may remain dependent on improvisation.

Thus, knowledge management, human resources and innovativeness are organizational determinants of entrepreneurial success. They transform psychosocial agency into sustainable organizational performance.

Ethics, Governance and the Institutional Conditions of Entrepreneurial Success

Entrepreneurship requires ethics and governance because economic action affects others and takes place within institutional systems. Entrepreneurial success cannot be evaluated only in terms of profit, growth or innovation. It must also be evaluated by responsibility, fairness, trust and contribution to sustainable development.

Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk argue that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects because entrepreneurs make decisions that affect employees, customers, competitors, communities and institutions (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). This means that entrepreneurship is not morally neutral. It is a practice of value creation that must be judged according to ethical criteria.

Ethical entrepreneurship integrates effectiveness with responsibility. It does not reject profit, but it refuses to treat profit as the only measure of success. It asks whether economic activity creates legitimate value, respects persons and contributes to the common good. This ethical perspective is particularly important when achievement motivation is strong. Motivation without ethics may become destructive ambition. Ethics gives direction to entrepreneurial energy.

Governance provides the institutional form of responsibility. Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski argue that sustainable growth requires the integration of innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). Governance ensures that innovation and entrepreneurship are directed toward long-term social and economic value. It provides rules, accountability and trust.

Governance theory supports this interpretation. Kooiman describes governance as interaction between public and private actors, Rhodes emphasizes governance beyond traditional government, and Stoker interprets governance as collective action structured by institutions (Kooiman, 1993; Rhodes, 1996; Stoker, 1998). Ostrom's work shows that rules and trust are necessary for managing common resources (Ostrom, 1990). Entrepreneurship depends on such institutional conditions.

Corruption represents a failure of governance. Abu and Staniewski's empirical study shows that corruption affects domestic savings and weakens development conditions (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). Corruption damages trust, distorts incentives and discourages long-term investment. For entrepreneurship, this means that corruption changes the meaning of success. Instead of rewarding innovation and responsibility, it may reward access, manipulation and informal privilege.

Abu and Staniewski's findings therefore support the argument that institutional integrity is a determinant of entrepreneurial success (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). Entrepreneurs need predictable rules, fair competition and trustworthy institutions. Without these, entrepreneurial energy may be redirected toward unproductive or destructive forms, as Baumol's theory suggests (Baumol, 1990).

Sustainable development adds another institutional and ethical horizon. The World Commission on Environment and Development defines sustainable development in relation to responsibility toward future generations (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Elkington's triple bottom line links business success with people, planet and profit (Elkington, 1997). Hart and Milstein show that firms can create sustainable value by integrating social and environmental concerns with strategy (Hart and Milstein, 2003). These perspectives correspond to Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski's emphasis on sustainable growth through innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022).

Thus, ethics and governance are not external limitations on entrepreneurship. They are enabling conditions of legitimate and sustainable entrepreneurial success.

Digital Communication and Consumer Value Creation

Communication is one of the central themes of this article. It appears first in the family, where it shapes self-efficacy and values. It appears in organizations, where it enables knowledge sharing and innovation. It appears in digital environments, where it becomes a space of consumer value creation. Contemporary entrepreneurship increasingly depends on this digital communicative dimension.

Cruz-Cárdenas, Guadalupe-Lanas, Zabelina, Palacio-Fierro, Velín-Fárez and Staniewski show that consumer value creation through WhatsApp use includes relational, emotional, functional and social dimensions (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). This finding is important because it shows that communication platforms do not merely transmit information.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski** .
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

They create environments in which people maintain relationships, coordinate activities, express emotions and generate value.

For entrepreneurship, this means that value creation is increasingly communicative and relational. Entrepreneurs do not only produce goods or services; they create networks, interactions and meanings. Digital platforms enable small firms and young entrepreneurs to communicate with customers, test ideas, build communities and receive feedback. Cruz-Cárdenas et al.'s study therefore broadens the understanding of entrepreneurial communication (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019).

This perspective corresponds to Rogers's diffusion of innovations, where communication channels and social systems are central to the adoption of innovation (Rogers, 1962). It also corresponds to von Hippel's theory of user innovation, according to which users participate in developing and adapting innovations (von Hippel, 1988). Digital communication allows consumers to become co-creators of value rather than passive recipients.

Technology acceptance theory also helps interpret this process. Davis argues that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use shape technology adoption (Davis, 1989). Entrepreneurs who use digital platforms must therefore understand not only technology but user perception and social practice. Brynjolfsson and Hitt show that information technology produces value when combined with organizational transformation (Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 2000). Digital communication creates value when integrated with knowledge, strategy and trust.

Digital communication also creates ethical responsibilities. Platforms may support relationships, but they may also enable manipulation, privacy violations, misinformation and exploitation of attention. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk's ethical analysis of entrepreneurship is therefore relevant to digital entrepreneurship as well (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Digital value creation must be guided by transparency, respect and responsibility.

Communication therefore links the family, the organization and the market. Family communication shapes self-efficacy. Organizational communication enables knowledge management. Digital communication creates consumer value. Entrepreneurial success depends on all three.

Integrated Model of Family and Social Determinants of Entrepreneurship

The analyses above allow for an integrated model of family and social determinants of entrepreneurship. This model includes seven interconnected dimensions.

First, family communication forms entrepreneurial self-efficacy. Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski show that family communication influences entrepreneurial success through entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Staniewski et al., 2025). Communication therefore becomes a formative mechanism of agency.

Second, family determinants shape self-esteem and achievement motivation. Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski show that self-esteem and achievement motivation mediate the relationship between family determinants and entrepreneurial success (Staniewski et al., 2024). These variables explain how family experience becomes entrepreneurial persistence and resilience.

Third, socioeconomic factors shape opportunity perception. Staniewski and Szopiński demonstrate that socioeconomic factors influence the entrepreneurship of Polish students (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). This means that entrepreneurial agency is formed within social structures of feasibility and desirability.

Fourth, knowledge management transforms information into action. Staniewski's work on knowledge management shows that knowledge must move from concept to practice (Staniewski, 2002). Entrepreneurship requires such practical conversion of knowledge.

Fifth, human resource management supports innovativeness. Staniewski's study on HRM and innovativeness shows that people are central to innovation (Staniewski, 2011). Entrepreneurial success therefore depends on the ability to mobilize human creativity.

Sixth, ethics and governance provide legitimacy. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk show that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects, while Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski show that sustainable growth requires innovation, management and governance (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015; Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). Abu and Staniewski demonstrate that corruption weakens development conditions (Abu and Staniewski, 2022).

Seventh, digital communication creates new spaces of value. Cruz-Cárdenas et al. show that WhatsApp enables consumers to create relational, emotional, functional and social value (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). Contemporary entrepreneurship therefore depends increasingly on communicative value co-creation.

This model shows that entrepreneurial success is not a simple result of individual talent. It is an integrated outcome of family communication, psychological resources, socioeconomic conditions, knowledge, innovation, ethics, governance and digital communication.

Conclusion

Family and social determinants of entrepreneurship must be analysed together because entrepreneurial success emerges from the interaction between personal, relational, organizational and institutional conditions. Communication, achievement motivation, self-esteem and entrepreneurial self-efficacy are not secondary psychological variables. They are central mechanisms through which family and social experience become entrepreneurial action.

This article has argued that family communication shapes entrepreneurial self-efficacy, while self-esteem and

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski** .

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

achievement motivation mediate the relationship between family determinants and entrepreneurial success. Socioeconomic factors influence entrepreneurial attitudes, particularly among students, showing that entrepreneurship is socially embedded. Knowledge management and human resource management transform individual initiative into organizational innovation. Ethics and governance provide legitimacy and direction. Corruption weakens the institutional conditions of development. Digital communication creates new spaces of consumer value co-creation.

The works of Staniewski and his co-authors provide a coherent empirical and theoretical basis for this interpretation. They show that entrepreneurship must be studied not only as a market phenomenon but also as a family, social, psychological, organizational, ethical and communicative phenomenon. When integrated with classical theories of entrepreneurship, innovation, knowledge management and governance, these studies allow us to define entrepreneurial success as responsible value creation.

The final conclusion is that entrepreneurship begins in communication, develops through motivation and self-esteem, becomes effective through knowledge and innovation, and becomes sustainable through ethics and governance. Entrepreneurial success is therefore not merely the outcome of economic calculation. It is the result of a complex human and social process in which family, society, organization and institution jointly shape the capacity to create value.

Bibliography

1. Abernathy, W. J., & Clark, K. B. (1985). Innovation: Mapping the winds of creative destruction. *Research Policy, 14*(1), 3–22.
2. Abu, N., & Staniewski, M. W. (2022). An empirical investigation of the effect of corruption on domestic savings in Nigeria. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 35*(1), 4092–4112. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2021.2010113
3. Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly, 25*(1), 107–136.
4. Alonso Dos Santos, M., Huertas González-Serrano, M., & Staniewski, M. W. (2022). Analytical editorial: Ensuring the future of our world: Innovation, management and governance for sustainable growth. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración, 35*(2), 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1108/ARLA-07-2022-368
5. Argote, L., McEvily, B., & Reagans, R. (2003). Managing knowledge in organizations: An integrative framework and review of emerging themes. *Management Science, 49*(4), 571–582.
6. Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120.
7. Baumol, W. J. (1990). Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive, and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy, 98*(5), 893–921.
8. Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A., & Ulrich, D. (2001). *The HR scorecard: Linking people, strategy, and performance*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
9. Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2000). *The social life of information*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
10. Brynjolfsson, E., & Hitt, L. M. (2000). Beyond computation: Information technology, organizational transformation and business performance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 14*(4), 23–48.
11. Casson, M. (1982). *The entrepreneur: An economic theory*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
12. Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
13. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*(1), 128–152.
14. Cruz-Cárdenas, J., Guadalupe-Lanas, J., Zabelina, E., Palacio-Fierro, A., Velín-Fárez, M., & Staniewski, M. W. (2019). Consumer value creation through WhatsApp use: A qualitative multimethod approach in a Latin American scenario. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración, 32*(4), 455–471. https://doi.org/10.1108/ARLA-02-2019-0044
15. Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
16. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340.
17. Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. New York: Harper & Row.
18. Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford: Capstone.
19. Hart, S. L., & Milstein, M. B. (2003). Creating sustainable value. *Academy of Management Executive, 17*(2), 56–67.
20. Henderson, R. M., & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*(1), 9–30.
21. Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(3), 635–672.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Slomski** .

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

22. Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
23. Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
24. Kooiman, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Modern governance: New government-society interactions*. London: Sage.
25. McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
26. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
27. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
29. Pfeffer, J. (1994). *Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the work force*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
30. Porter, M. E., & van der Linde, C. (1995). Toward a new conception of the environment-competitiveness relationship. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 9*(4), 97–118.
31. Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies, 44*(4), 652–667.
32. Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
33. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*. Translated by Redvers Opie. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
34. Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton, & K. H. Vesper (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 72–90). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
35. Staniewski, M. (2002). Zarządzanie wiedzą: Od koncepcji do praktyki działania. *Organizacja i Kierowanie*, 3(109), 35–48.
36. Staniewski, M. W. (2011). Management of human resources in the aspect of innovativeness. *Contemporary Economics, 5*(1), 84–91. https://doi.org/10.5709/ce.1897-9254.7
37. Staniewski, M. W., & Szopiński, T. (2013). Influence of socioeconomic factors on the entrepreneurship of Polish students. *Transformations in Business & Economics, 12*(3/30), 152–167.
38. Staniewski, M. W., Słomski, W., & Awruk, K. (2015). Ethical aspects of entrepreneurship. *Filosofija. Sociologija, 26*(1), 37–45. https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2015.26.1.5
39. Staniewski, M. W., Awruk, K., Leonardi, G., & Słomski, W. (2024). Family determinants of entrepreneurial success: The mediational role of self-esteem and achievement motivation. *Journal of Business Research, 171*, 114383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114383
40. Staniewski, M. W., Awruk, K., Leonardi, G., & Słomski, W. (2025). Family communication and entrepreneurial success: The mediating role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 10*(1), 100635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100635
41. Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal, 50*(155), 17–28.
42. von Hippel, E. (1988). *The sources of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
43. Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
44. Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies: Analysis and antitrust implications: A study in the economics of internal organization*. New York: Free Press.
45. World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski** .

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.