



ISIR Journal of Business and Management Studies (ISIRJBMS)

ISSN: 3048-7684 (Online)

Frequency: Bimonthly

Published By ISIR Publisher

Journal Homepage Link- <https://isirpublisher.com/isirjbms-home/>



Between Family, Knowledge and Innovation: Psychosocial and Organizational Determinants of Entrepreneurial Success

By

Anna Wawrzonkiewicz – Słomska.



Article History

Received: 25/04/2026

Accepted: 05/05/2026

Published: 07/05/2026

Vol – 3 Issue – 3

PP: -28-38

DOI:10.5281/zenodo.
20070436

Abstract

This article examines entrepreneurial success as a multidimensional phenomenon situated between family formation, knowledge management and organizational innovation. Its central thesis is that entrepreneurial success cannot be reduced either to individual talent, economic opportunity or managerial efficiency. Rather, it should be interpreted as the result of a complex interaction between psychosocial determinants, family communication, self-efficacy, self-esteem, achievement motivation, socioeconomic conditions, knowledge management, human resource practices, ethical responsibility, digital communication and institutional governance.

The article integrates classical theories of entrepreneurship and innovation with contemporary studies on family and organizational determinants of entrepreneurial success. Particular attention is given to the works of Marcin W. Staniewski and his co-authors, especially studies on the entrepreneurship of Polish students, family communication and entrepreneurial self-efficacy, family determinants of entrepreneurial success, human resource management and innovativeness, knowledge management, ethical aspects of entrepreneurship, consumer value creation through WhatsApp use, corruption and domestic savings, and sustainable growth through innovation, management and governance.

The first part presents entrepreneurship as a psychosocial and socioeconomic phenomenon. The second part analyses family communication as a formative source of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. The third part discusses self-esteem and achievement motivation as mediating mechanisms of entrepreneurial success. The fourth part examines knowledge management and human resource management as organizational foundations of innovation. The fifth part addresses ethical and institutional determinants of entrepreneurship, including corruption and governance. The sixth part discusses digital communication and consumer value creation as new environments of entrepreneurial action. The article concludes that entrepreneurial success requires an integrated model in which family, knowledge and innovation are treated as mutually reinforcing dimensions of responsible economic agency.

Keywords: *entrepreneurship; entrepreneurial success; family communication; self-efficacy; self-esteem; achievement motivation; knowledge management; innovation; human resource management; ethics; governance; sustainable growth.*

Introduction

Entrepreneurial success is one of the central categories of contemporary management and entrepreneurship studies. It is often understood in terms of business growth, profitability, survival, market expansion or innovation. Yet such an interpretation remains incomplete if it fails to consider the psychosocial and organizational conditions through which entrepreneurial action becomes possible. The entrepreneur

does not appear in the market as an isolated rational actor. He or she is formed by family relations, educational experiences, socioeconomic circumstances, psychological resources, knowledge structures, organizational practices and institutional environments. Entrepreneurial success is therefore not only an economic result but also a psychosocial and organizational achievement.

The classical theory of entrepreneurship provides an indispensable starting point for this analysis. Schumpeter



understood the entrepreneur as an agent of innovation and creative destruction, one who introduces new combinations into economic life and thereby transforms markets and industries (Schumpeter, 1934). Drucker later argued that entrepreneurship and innovation are not accidental phenomena but disciplined practices that can be learned and managed (Drucker, 1985). Kirzner emphasized entrepreneurial alertness to opportunities, while Knight interpreted entrepreneurship in relation to risk and uncertainty (Knight, 1921; Kirzner, 1973). These perspectives remain important, but they must be expanded by a more relational, psychological and organizational approach.

Entrepreneurial success depends on more than opportunity recognition. It requires self-efficacy, confidence, motivation, resilience, knowledge, communication skills, ethical judgement and the ability to mobilize people and resources. In this sense, entrepreneurial success is not only a result of market conditions but also the outcome of psychosocial formation. Family, education and social background influence how individuals perceive opportunities, interpret risk, respond to failure and understand responsibility.

This point is confirmed by the research of Staniewski and Szopiński on the influence of socioeconomic factors on the entrepreneurship of Polish students. Their study shows that entrepreneurial attitudes among students are shaped by socioeconomic conditions, which means that entrepreneurial readiness cannot be reduced to individual disposition alone (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). The student entrepreneur is situated within a broader environment of family expectations, educational resources, labour-market prospects and perceived feasibility of business creation. Thus, entrepreneurship must be understood as socially embedded agency.

The family dimension is even more fundamental. 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 within the family shapes the individual's belief in his or her ability to perform entrepreneurial tasks. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy is therefore not merely an individual psychological variable; it is a relationally formed capacity. In another study, Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski show that family determinants influence entrepreneurial success through self-esteem and achievement motivation (Staniewski et al., 2024). Together, these findings indicate that entrepreneurial success is rooted in family communication, self-understanding and motivational structures.

However, family and psychological factors alone are insufficient. Entrepreneurship develops within organizations and markets. Innovation requires knowledge, human resources and organizational learning. Staniewski's work on human resource management in the aspect of innovativeness shows that innovative potential is inseparable from the way organizations manage people (Staniewski, 2011). His article on knowledge management, from concept to practice, demonstrates that knowledge must be translated into

organizational routines and action if it is to become a real source of competitive advantage (Staniewski, 2002). These arguments correspond with the broader literature on knowledge creation, organizational learning and absorptive capacity (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995; Cohen and Levinthal, 1990; Argote, McEvily and Reagans, 2003; Davenport and Prusak, 1998).

Entrepreneurial success also has an ethical and institutional dimension. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk argue that entrepreneurship must be interpreted ethically because economic action always affects others and therefore cannot be separated from responsibility (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). This ethical dimension becomes particularly visible in institutional environments marked by corruption. Abu and Staniewski's empirical investigation of corruption and domestic savings in Nigeria shows that corruption affects economic behaviour and weakens the foundations of development (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). Governance and institutional trust therefore belong to the conditions of entrepreneurial success.

Finally, the contemporary entrepreneur operates increasingly in digital and networked 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 broadens the concept of entrepreneurial success: value is not created only through production or exchange, but also through communication, networks and digital interaction. Similarly, Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski link the future of sustainable growth with innovation, management and governance, indicating that entrepreneurship must be situated within a wider framework of responsible development (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022).

The aim of this article is to develop an integrated interpretation of entrepreneurial success located between family, knowledge and innovation. It argues that entrepreneurial success emerges where psychosocial formation, organizational learning, ethical responsibility and institutional governance intersect. Family communication forms self-efficacy; self-esteem and achievement motivation support persistence; socioeconomic conditions shape opportunity perception; knowledge management and HRM enable innovation; ethics and governance protect legitimacy; digital communication creates new spaces of value. Entrepreneurial success is therefore not a single outcome but a multidimensional process of responsible value creation.

Entrepreneurship as a Psychosocial and Socioeconomic Phenomenon

Entrepreneurship is frequently described through categories of initiative, opportunity, risk and innovation. These categories are necessary, but they do not exhaust the phenomenon. Entrepreneurial action is always performed by a person whose motivations, expectations and capacities have been shaped by social and psychological conditions. For this reason,

entrepreneurship should be interpreted as both a psychosocial and socioeconomic phenomenon.

Classical economic theories tended to emphasize the entrepreneur's function within the market. Schumpeter interpreted the entrepreneur as the agent of new combinations and creative destruction (Schumpeter, 1934). Knight linked entrepreneurship with uncertainty and risk-bearing (Knight, 1921). Kirzner understood entrepreneurship as alertness to opportunities that others have not yet perceived (Kirzner, 1973). Casson described the entrepreneur as a specialist in judgmental decision-making under conditions of uncertainty (Casson, 1982). These theories identify essential aspects of entrepreneurship, but they often leave underdeveloped the question of how entrepreneurial capacity is socially and psychologically formed.

The study by Staniewski and Szopiński addresses precisely this issue by examining the influence of socioeconomic factors on the entrepreneurship of Polish students (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). Their findings show that entrepreneurial attitudes are not detached from social position, educational environment and economic expectations. Students do not simply decide to become entrepreneurs because of abstract preference. Their entrepreneurial intentions are shaped by perceived opportunity, access to resources, family background, social models and expectations concerning the labour market.

This insight corresponds to Shapero and Sokol's theory of the social dimensions of entrepreneurship. According to this approach, entrepreneurial action depends on perceived desirability, perceived feasibility and propensity to act (Shapero and Sokol, 1982). Socioeconomic factors influence all three. If entrepreneurship is socially valued but practically inaccessible, intention may remain weak. If it is accessible but socially risky or culturally discouraged, individuals may avoid it. Thus, the entrepreneurial decision emerges from the interaction between subjective motivation and objective conditions.

Staniewski and Szopiński's research is particularly important because it concerns students, that is, individuals located at the threshold between education and economic independence (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). This transitional position makes students a valuable group for examining how entrepreneurial aspirations are formed. Their attitudes reveal not only personal ambition but also the perceived credibility of the economic system. If students believe that effort, knowledge and initiative can lead to success, entrepreneurship becomes more attractive. If they perceive the market as unstable, unfair or closed, entrepreneurial intentions may weaken.

The socioeconomic embeddedness of entrepreneurship also has implications for public policy and education. Entrepreneurship education cannot be limited to technical knowledge of business planning, accounting or marketing. It must also address self-efficacy, resilience, ethical responsibility, institutional literacy and innovation capability. Educational institutions should help students interpret

opportunities realistically, understand risk, develop networks and connect knowledge with action.

This approach is consistent with Baumol's distinction between productive, unproductive and destructive entrepreneurship (Baumol, 1990). Entrepreneurial energy exists in society, but institutions determine whether it is directed toward innovation, rent-seeking or destructive activity. If socioeconomic conditions reward creativity, responsibility and productive activity, entrepreneurship contributes to development. If they reward manipulation or opportunism, entrepreneurship may become socially harmful.

The resource-based view of the firm also helps interpret entrepreneurial success. Barney argues that sustainable competitive advantage depends on resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (Barney, 1991). In entrepreneurship, such resources include not only financial capital or technology but also knowledge, motivation, self-efficacy, family support, 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). Thus, entrepreneurial success depends on both external opportunities and internal capacities.

Entrepreneurship is therefore neither purely individual nor purely structural. It is the outcome of interaction between personal agency and social conditions. Staniewski and Szopiński's findings show that socioeconomic context influences entrepreneurial attitudes, but it does not eliminate personal responsibility (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). Rather, it shapes the field within which responsibility is exercised. The entrepreneur is a situated agent: free, but not abstract; creative, but conditioned; responsible, but embedded.

Family Communication and Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy

The psychosocial foundations of entrepreneurship are most clearly visible in the family. Family is the first environment in which individuals learn communication, responsibility, trust, autonomy and attitudes toward achievement. It is also the first context in which individuals experience support, criticism, recognition and failure. For this reason, family communication should be treated as one of the most important formative factors of entrepreneurial success.

Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski's study on family communication and entrepreneurial success demonstrates that entrepreneurial self-efficacy mediates the relationship between family communication and entrepreneurial outcomes (Staniewski et al., 2025). This means that the family does not influence entrepreneurial success only through material resources or social status. It influences success by shaping the entrepreneur's belief in his or her capacity to act effectively. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy becomes the internal psychological mechanism through which family communication is translated into entrepreneurial action.

This finding is crucial because entrepreneurship requires action under uncertainty. Entrepreneurs must identify

opportunities, mobilize resources, make decisions without complete information and persist despite failure. Individuals with higher entrepreneurial self-efficacy are more likely to perceive difficult situations as challenges rather than threats. They are also more likely to act, experiment and learn. If family communication strengthens confidence, autonomy and problem-solving, it contributes directly to entrepreneurial capacity.

The role of self-efficacy also connects family studies with innovation theory. Innovation requires belief in the possibility of change. Entrepreneurs who lack self-efficacy may avoid experimentation and prefer safe routines. Those with stronger self-efficacy may be more willing to challenge existing practices, develop new products, enter new markets or create new organizational forms. Thus, family communication can influence innovation indirectly by shaping the psychological conditions of entrepreneurial action.

The study by Staniewski et al. should also be interpreted in relation to McClelland's theory of achievement motivation (McClelland, 1961). Achievement motivation is not simply an internal trait; it develops in relational contexts. A family that encourages initiative, provides constructive feedback and allows responsible autonomy may strengthen the individual's orientation toward achievement. Conversely, a family environment marked by excessive control, fear or destructive criticism may weaken self-efficacy and reduce entrepreneurial readiness.

Family communication is also related to how individuals interpret failure. Entrepreneurship involves failure as part of learning. If family communication treats failure as final humiliation, individuals may avoid risk. If failure is interpreted as a stage of learning, individuals may develop resilience. This distinction is essential for entrepreneurial success. Markets are uncertain, innovation is experimental and business creation often requires repeated attempts. Self-efficacy helps entrepreneurs continue acting despite setbacks.

Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski's research contributes to entrepreneurship studies by showing that the family is not a marginal background variable but a structural determinant of entrepreneurial success (Staniewski et al., 2025). The entrepreneur enters the market with a certain communicative and psychological history. He or she has learned how to negotiate, trust, ask for help, respond to criticism, evaluate risk and interpret responsibility. These capacities are deeply connected with family communication.

The ethical dimension should also be noted. Family communication transmits not only confidence but also values. If communication is based on respect, responsibility and fairness, these patterns may later appear in entrepreneurial and managerial conduct. If communication teaches manipulation, domination or irresponsibility, these patterns may also be reproduced in business. Thus, family communication is not only a psychological factor but also an ethical and cultural foundation of entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurial self-efficacy therefore stands at the intersection of family, psychology and economic action. It is personal, but socially formed. It is psychological, but economically consequential. It is relational, but expressed in individual initiative. The family becomes a pre-organizational environment in which the future entrepreneur learns the first grammar of agency.

Self-Esteem, Achievement Motivation and Entrepreneurial Success

Entrepreneurial success depends not only on self-efficacy but also on self-esteem and achievement motivation. These variables shape how entrepreneurs evaluate themselves, define goals, endure obstacles and pursue success. They are especially important because entrepreneurship is a process of continuous uncertainty, comparison, adaptation and self-evaluation.

Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski's study on family determinants of entrepreneurial success shows that self-esteem and achievement motivation mediate the relationship between family determinants and entrepreneurial success (Staniewski et al., 2024). This means that family background influences entrepreneurship not mechanically but through psychological structures. Self-esteem gives individuals a sense of personal worth, while achievement motivation directs their energy toward goal-oriented activity.

The importance of self-esteem lies in its relation to agency. Entrepreneurs must make decisions that expose them to criticism, uncertainty and possible failure. Without a stable sense of self-worth, failure may be interpreted as personal collapse rather than as feedback. High self-esteem does not guarantee success, but it can help entrepreneurs maintain psychological stability in conditions of pressure. It allows them to separate temporary business failure from personal worth.

Achievement motivation, in turn, directs entrepreneurial action toward accomplishment. McClelland's theory of the achieving society emphasized that individuals with a strong need for achievement tend to prefer tasks of moderate risk, seek feedback and strive for excellence (McClelland, 1961). Staniewski et al. refine this tradition by showing that achievement motivation is connected with family determinants and self-esteem (Staniewski et al., 2024). Entrepreneurship is therefore not merely the expression of ambition; it is the outcome of a motivational structure formed through social experience.

This approach helps explain why entrepreneurial success is not reducible to technical competence. Two individuals may possess similar knowledge and access to similar opportunities, yet differ significantly in persistence, confidence and willingness to learn from failure. The difference may lie in psychological mediators. Self-esteem and achievement motivation shape how individuals interpret obstacles. They influence whether a difficulty becomes a reason to withdraw or a stimulus to improve.

Self-esteem and achievement motivation also influence leadership. Entrepreneurs often become founders and managers. Their psychological structures affect how they communicate with employees, delegate tasks, handle conflict and respond to innovation. Low self-esteem may lead to defensive leadership, micromanagement or fear of competition. Healthy self-esteem may support trust, delegation and openness to others' ideas. Achievement motivation may produce strategic focus, but if detached from ethics, it may also lead to excessive pressure or instrumental treatment of people.

This is why the psychological determinants of entrepreneurial success must be connected with ethics. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk's analysis of the ethical aspects of entrepreneurship reminds us that entrepreneurial success cannot be evaluated only in terms of personal achievement (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Achievement must be responsible. Self-esteem must not become narcissism. Motivation must not become exploitation. Psychosocial strength becomes ethically meaningful only when oriented toward value creation and respect for others.

The study by Staniewski et al. also helps integrate family research with organizational theory. If self-esteem and achievement motivation are formed in family contexts and later influence business success, then entrepreneurial organizations carry traces of family-derived patterns (Staniewski et al., 2024). The entrepreneur's way of motivating employees, interpreting competition and defining success may reflect deeper biographical structures. Organizational culture often begins in the founder's psychological and moral formation.

Thus, entrepreneurial success should be analysed as a mediated phenomenon. Family determinants influence psychological variables; psychological variables influence entrepreneurial action; entrepreneurial action shapes organizational outcomes. This layered structure prevents simplistic explanations. Success is neither purely inherited nor purely self-made. It is constructed through the interaction of family, personality, motivation, knowledge, organization and environment.

Knowledge Management as an Organizational Condition of Entrepreneurial Success

Entrepreneurial success requires knowledge. However, knowledge should not be reduced to information. In organizations, knowledge includes experience, interpretation, skills, routines, values, tacit understanding and the ability to act effectively in changing circumstances. Entrepreneurship depends on the capacity to recognize opportunities, interpret signals, learn from feedback and transform knowledge into innovation.

Staniewski's article *Zarządzanie wiedzą: od koncepcji do praktyki działania* is important because it emphasizes the transition from the concept of knowledge management to practical action (Staniewski, 2002). Knowledge management

is not merely a theoretical discourse or a technological system. It is an organizational process through which knowledge is identified, shared, interpreted and applied. Entrepreneurial success depends on this process because entrepreneurs must transform dispersed knowledge into meaningful decisions.

This practical understanding corresponds to Davenport and Prusak's theory of working knowledge, according to which knowledge is a combination of experience, values, contextual information and expert insight (Davenport and Prusak, 1998). It also corresponds to Alavi and Leidner's analysis of knowledge management systems, which shows that technology can support knowledge processes but does not itself create understanding (Alavi and Leidner, 2001). Knowledge becomes valuable only when embedded in human and organizational practice.

Nonaka and Takeuchi's concept of the knowledge-creating company provides a central theoretical framework. They argue that organizational knowledge develops through the conversion of tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). Tacit knowledge is personal and difficult to formalize; explicit knowledge can be codified and communicated. Entrepreneurial organizations must convert individual insights into shared practices and transform organizational learning into new products, services and strategies.

Staniewski's practical orientation toward knowledge management can be read as a bridge between conceptual knowledge and entrepreneurial implementation (Staniewski, 2002). Entrepreneurs often operate in environments where knowledge is incomplete, fragmented and uncertain. They must learn rapidly, interpret weak signals and make decisions before full certainty is available. Knowledge management helps structure this process by creating organizational memory, communication channels and learning routines.

Cohen and Levinthal's concept of absorptive capacity is also essential. Organizations can recognize and use external knowledge only when they possess relevant prior knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). Entrepreneurial success therefore depends not only on openness to the environment but also on internal learning capability. A firm may observe opportunities but fail to exploit them if it lacks the knowledge base required for interpretation and implementation.

Argote, McEvily and Reagans emphasize knowledge transfer, retention and integration as central organizational processes (Argote, McEvily and Reagans, 2003). This is especially relevant for entrepreneurial firms, where knowledge is often concentrated in founders or small teams. If such knowledge is not institutionalized, the firm remains fragile. Sustainable entrepreneurial success requires the movement from individual knowledge to organizational capability.

Knowledge management is also linked with innovation. Innovation arises when knowledge is recombined, reinterpreted and applied in new contexts. Kline and Rosenberg's chain-linked model of innovation shows that

innovation is not a linear process but involves feedback, learning and interaction between knowledge and practice (Kline and Rosenberg, 1986). Teece's theory of profiting from technological innovation also indicates that firms must possess complementary assets and capabilities to benefit from innovation (Teece, 1986).

Entrepreneurial success therefore requires knowledge-based organization. The entrepreneur must be not only a risk-taker but also a learner, interpreter and organizer of knowledge. The firm must be not only a vehicle for market action but also a community of learning. Staniewski's approach to knowledge management highlights precisely this movement from concept to practice, from information to action and from individual cognition to organizational competence (Staniewski, 2002).

Human Resource Management, Innovativeness and Organizational Learning

If knowledge is one foundation of entrepreneurial success, human resources are the living carriers of that knowledge. Organizations do not innovate by systems alone. They innovate through people: their creativity, commitment, experience, cooperation and capacity to learn. Human resource management is therefore not an administrative function only, but a strategic and innovative function.

Staniewski's article on the management of human resources in the aspect of innovativeness argues that HRM is directly connected with the innovative potential of enterprises (Staniewski, 2011). Employees are not merely labour inputs; they are sources of ideas, problem-solving, tacit knowledge and organizational renewal. An innovative enterprise must therefore create conditions in which employees can participate actively in knowledge creation and innovation.

This view corresponds with Pfeffer's argument that competitive advantage can be built through people (Pfeffer, 1994). Huselid shows that HRM practices influence turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance (Huselid, 1995). Becker, Huselid and Ulrich further argue that HR systems must be connected with strategy and performance measurement (Becker, Huselid and Ulrich, 2001). Together, these works confirm that human resources are strategic assets, not merely operational costs.

Staniewski's contribution lies in linking human resource management specifically with innovativeness (Staniewski, 2011). Innovation requires more than creative individuals. It requires recruitment systems that attract talent, training systems that develop competence, incentive systems that support initiative, leadership systems that encourage participation and organizational cultures that tolerate experimentation. Without such HRM practices, innovation remains accidental.

Schuler and Jackson's work on linking competitive strategies with HRM practices is relevant here because it shows that different strategies require different employee behaviours (Schuler and Jackson, 1987). A strategy based on innovation

requires autonomy, creativity, cooperation and tolerance of ambiguity. Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg and Kalleberg demonstrate that high-performance work systems can create advantage by combining employee involvement, skill development and incentives (Appelbaum et al., 2000). Innovative entrepreneurship therefore requires HR systems aligned with learning and experimentation.

Organizational learning theory deepens this perspective. Senge's concept of the learning organization emphasizes systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning and personal mastery (Senge, 1990). Brown and Duguid's analysis of communities of practice shows that learning often occurs informally through shared practice and participation (Brown and Duguid, 1991). Wenger similarly interprets communities of practice as spaces where learning, identity and meaning are formed (Wenger, 1998). These theories show that innovation is embedded in social learning.

Entrepreneurial organizations must therefore integrate HRM, knowledge management and innovation. Knowledge must be shared; employees must be empowered; learning must be institutionalized. If knowledge remains hidden, employees remain passive and leadership remains controlling, innovativeness is weakened. If HRM encourages autonomy and knowledge sharing, innovation becomes part of organizational culture.

This argument connects directly with entrepreneurial success. New ventures often fail not only because their ideas are weak but because they cannot organize people, knowledge and learning. A founder may possess vision, but success requires collective capability. Human resource management helps transform entrepreneurial intention into organizational performance. Staniewski's analysis of HRM and innovativeness thus belongs at the centre of any theory of entrepreneurial success (Staniewski, 2011).

Ethical Aspects of Entrepreneurship and the Meaning of Success

Entrepreneurial success must be evaluated ethically. A business may grow, generate profit and gain market share while still damaging employees, consumers, communities or institutions. If success is defined only economically, entrepreneurship risks becoming morally blind. Therefore, any adequate theory of entrepreneurial success must ask not only whether the entrepreneur succeeds, but also what kind of success is achieved and at whose cost.

Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk argue that entrepreneurship has essential ethical aspects because economic activity involves responsibility toward others (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Entrepreneurship is not simply private initiative. It affects employees, customers, suppliers, competitors and public institutions. Entrepreneurial decisions concerning wages, contracts, marketing, taxes, innovation and environmental impact are moral decisions as well as economic ones.

This ethical approach challenges the reduction of success to profit. Profit is necessary for business survival, but it is not

sufficient as a measure of entrepreneurial value. Ethical entrepreneurship integrates effectiveness with responsibility. It creates value without destroying trust. It innovates without manipulating. It competes without abandoning fairness. It pursues growth without ignoring social and environmental consequences.

Baumol's distinction between productive, unproductive and destructive entrepreneurship again becomes important (Baumol, 1990). Entrepreneurial talent can serve innovation and social value, but it can also serve rent-seeking, corruption or exploitation. Ethics helps determine the direction of entrepreneurial energy. Without ethical orientation, entrepreneurship may become technically successful but socially harmful.

The ethical dimension is also connected with trust and transaction costs. Williamson's theory of markets and hierarchies shows that economic exchange is shaped by transaction costs and governance mechanisms (Williamson, 1975). Ethical behaviour reduces the need for costly monitoring and increases cooperation. Trust becomes an economic asset. Conversely, unethical conduct weakens reputation and increases uncertainty.

Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk's ethical analysis should also be connected with family and psychosocial determinants (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). If family communication shapes self-efficacy and self-esteem, it may also shape moral orientation. Entrepreneurs learn not only how to act but also how to understand responsibility. A person formed in a communicative environment of respect may be more likely to reproduce respect in organizational life. Conversely, patterns of domination or manipulation may also become managerial habits.

Ethical success also requires a broader view of innovation. Innovation is not good simply because it is new. New technologies, services or business models may produce harm if they violate privacy, exploit users, damage the environment or intensify inequality. Therefore, innovation must be governed by ethical criteria. Porter and van der Linde argue that environmental responsibility can stimulate competitiveness rather than merely impose costs (Porter and van der Linde, 1995). Hart's natural-resource-based view of the firm also shows that ecological responsibility can become a strategic capability (Hart, 1995).

Thus, entrepreneurial success should be understood as responsible value creation. It includes economic performance, but also legitimacy, trust, ethical coherence and contribution to the common good. The entrepreneur is successful not only when the firm survives or grows, but when the value created is morally sustainable.

Governance, Corruption and Institutional Determinants of Entrepreneurial Success

Entrepreneurial success depends not only on the entrepreneur, the family and the organization. It also depends on the institutional environment. Governance structures, legal systems, administrative practices, corruption levels and public

trust influence whether entrepreneurial activity is productive, risky, attractive or distorted. Institutions shape the rules of the game.

Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski link the future of sustainable growth with innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). This triad is significant because entrepreneurship requires all three. Innovation creates new possibilities; management organizes resources; governance provides legitimacy, coordination and direction. Without governance, innovation may become chaotic or socially harmful. Without innovation, governance may become static. Without management, neither innovation nor governance can be translated into effective practice.

Governance theory provides important tools for understanding entrepreneurial success. Kooiman describes governance as interaction between public and private actors, while Rhodes emphasizes the rise of governance beyond traditional government (Kooiman, 1993; Rhodes, 1996). Stoker formulates governance as a theory of collective action, and Ostrom shows that institutional rules and trust are essential for governing common resources (Stoker, 1998; Ostrom, 1990). These perspectives demonstrate that entrepreneurship does not occur outside institutional arrangements. It depends on laws, norms, networks and trust.

Corruption is one of the most destructive institutional barriers to entrepreneurial success. Abu and Staniewski's empirical investigation of the effect of corruption on domestic savings in Nigeria shows that corruption affects economic behaviour and weakens development conditions (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). If corruption undermines savings and institutional trust, it also weakens the environment in which entrepreneurs seek capital, plan investments and build long-term strategies. Corruption creates uncertainty, increases costs and rewards informal access rather than productive capability.

This problem is not limited to macroeconomics. At the entrepreneurial level, corruption changes incentives. Entrepreneurs may learn that success depends less on innovation and more on connections, bribery or manipulation of rules. In such an environment, productive entrepreneurship is weakened and unproductive entrepreneurship is rewarded. Abu and Staniewski's findings therefore support the view that institutional integrity is a condition of sustainable entrepreneurial success (Abu and Staniewski, 2022).

The connection between governance and sustainability is also central. The World Commission on Environment and Development defined sustainable development as development that meets present needs without compromising the needs of future generations (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Elkington's triple bottom line translated this idea into business language by linking people, planet and profit (Elkington, 1997). Hart and Milstein further argue that firms can create sustainable value by integrating social and environmental challenges with strategy (Hart and Milstein, 2003).

Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski's editorial can therefore be read as a programmatic statement: sustainable growth requires a responsible relationship between innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). Entrepreneurial success is not sustainable if it depends on institutional weakness, environmental exploitation or social distrust. It becomes sustainable when entrepreneurial innovation is coordinated with ethical governance and long-term responsibility.

The institutional dimension also connects with knowledge and HRM. Firms invest in knowledge and people when they believe that institutions are stable and fair. Corruption and weak governance discourage long-term investment in innovation because returns become uncertain. By contrast, reliable governance encourages entrepreneurs to build capabilities, train employees, develop knowledge systems and innovate responsibly.

Thus, entrepreneurial success requires institutional legitimacy. Family and psychology form the entrepreneur; knowledge and HRM form the organization; governance forms the environment. All three levels are necessary.

Digital Communication and Consumer Value Creation

The contemporary entrepreneur increasingly operates in digital environments. Digital platforms, mobile applications and social media transform the relationship between firms and consumers. Value is no longer produced only by firms and delivered to passive customers. It is co-created through communication, interaction, participation and networked practices.

Cruz-Cárdenas, Guadalupe-Lanas, Zabelina, Palacio-Fierro, Velín-Fárez and Staniewski's study on consumer value creation through WhatsApp use demonstrates that digital communication platforms enable users to create relational, emotional, functional and social value (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). WhatsApp is not merely a communication channel. It becomes a social space in which users coordinate roles, maintain relationships, share information and experience emotional support.

This finding is important for entrepreneurship because it expands the meaning of value creation. Entrepreneurs do not create value only through products, services or prices. They create value by enabling communication, trust, belonging and participation. Digital entrepreneurship is therefore relational. It depends on the ability to understand how consumers use technologies in everyday life.

The WhatsApp study also corresponds to broader theories of digital transformation. Davis's technology acceptance model emphasizes perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use as key factors in technology adoption (Davis, 1989). Brynjolfsson and Hitt argue that information technology improves performance when accompanied by organizational transformation (Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 2000). Westerman, Bonnet and McAfee show that digital transformation requires

leadership and strategic integration (Westerman, Bonnet and McAfee, 2014). These theories confirm that technology itself does not guarantee value. Value emerges when technology is embedded in meaningful practices.

Cruz-Cárdenas et al.'s findings also resonate with von Hippel's theory of user innovation (von Hippel, 1988). Users often adapt technologies for purposes not fully anticipated by firms. Rogers's diffusion theory likewise emphasizes that innovations spread through communication channels and social systems (Rogers, 1962). WhatsApp-based value creation illustrates how consumers participate in innovation through everyday use and reinterpretation of digital tools (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019).

Digital communication also requires ethical responsibility. Platforms can support relationships, but they can also create risks: misinformation, manipulation, surveillance, privacy violations and emotional dependency. Digital entrepreneurs must therefore combine innovation with ethics. Trust is especially fragile in digital environments. Once lost, it is difficult to rebuild.

The relationship between digital communication and entrepreneurial success also connects with knowledge management. Digital interactions generate information, but information must be interpreted. Choo's concept of the knowing organization shows that organizations use information to construct meaning, create knowledge and make decisions (Choo, 1998). Brown and Duguid emphasize the social life of information, showing that information is meaningful only within practices and communities (Brown and Duguid, 2000). Thus, digital entrepreneurship requires not only data collection but interpretive competence.

Digital value creation is therefore an important contemporary determinant of entrepreneurial success. Entrepreneurs must understand consumers not only as buyers but as communicators, participants and co-creators of value. This requires innovation, but also knowledge, ethics and relational sensitivity.

Toward an Integrated Model: Family, Knowledge and Innovation

The analysis developed in this article leads to an integrated model of entrepreneurial success based on three main pillars: family, knowledge and innovation. These pillars are not separate. They interact dynamically and shape the entrepreneur, the organization and the institutional environment.

The first pillar is family. Family communication forms the psychological basis of entrepreneurial agency. Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski show that family communication affects entrepreneurial success through entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Staniewski et al., 2025). They also show that family determinants influence success through self-esteem and achievement motivation (Staniewski et al., 2024). Family therefore shapes the entrepreneur's confidence, motivation and resilience. It provides the first environment in

which individuals learn how to act, communicate and interpret success.

The second pillar is knowledge. Entrepreneurship requires the ability to recognize, interpret and apply knowledge. Staniewski's work on knowledge management shows that knowledge must move from concept to practice in order to become organizationally effective (Staniewski, 2002). Knowledge management creates the cognitive infrastructure of entrepreneurial success. It allows firms to learn, adapt and innovate.

The third pillar is innovation. Innovation transforms knowledge and agency into new value. Staniewski's work on HRM and innovativeness demonstrates that innovation depends on people and human resource practices (Staniewski, 2011). Schumpeter, Drucker, Nonaka and Takeuchi, Cohen and Levinthal, and Teece all show in different ways that innovation requires creativity, learning, resources and strategic capability (Schumpeter, 1934; Drucker, 1985; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995; Cohen and Levinthal, 1990; Teece, 1986).

These three pillars must be situated within ethics and governance. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk show that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects that cannot be ignored (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski show that sustainable growth depends on innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). Abu and Staniewski show that corruption weakens institutional conditions of development (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). Cruz-Cárdenas et al. show that digital communication creates new spaces of consumer value (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019).

The integrated model can therefore be summarized as follows: family forms the entrepreneur, knowledge forms the organization, innovation forms competitive and social value, ethics gives direction, governance provides institutional legitimacy, and digital communication expands the field of value creation. Entrepreneurial success emerges when these dimensions reinforce one another.

Such a model rejects simplistic explanations of success. It is not enough to say that entrepreneurs succeed because they are talented, hardworking or lucky. They succeed when personal, relational, organizational and institutional conditions converge. Entrepreneurial success is therefore a systemic phenomenon. It requires psychological agency, family support, knowledge capability, human resources, innovation, ethics, governance and digital competence.

Conclusion

Entrepreneurial success in the contemporary economy must be understood as a multidimensional and integrated phenomenon. It is not reducible to profit, growth, opportunity recognition or individual ambition. It emerges at the intersection of family communication, psychosocial resources, socioeconomic conditions, knowledge management, human

resource management, innovation, ethics, governance and digital value creation.

This article has argued that family communication shapes entrepreneurial self-efficacy, while family determinants influence entrepreneurial success through self-esteem and achievement motivation. Socioeconomic factors shape entrepreneurial attitudes among students, showing that entrepreneurship is socially embedded. Knowledge management enables organizations to transform information and experience into action. Human resource management supports innovativeness by activating the creative potential of employees. Ethics defines the moral meaning of entrepreneurial success. Governance and institutional integrity protect sustainable 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 foundation for this integrated interpretation. Their studies show that entrepreneurial success is simultaneously personal, familial, organizational, ethical, institutional and digital. When read together with classical theories of entrepreneurship, knowledge management, innovation and governance, they allow us to formulate a model in which success is not merely economic achievement but responsible value creation.

The final conclusion is therefore clear: entrepreneurial success is located between family, knowledge and innovation. Family forms the person capable of action. Knowledge forms the organization capable of learning. Innovation forms the capacity to create new value. Ethics and governance ensure that this value remains legitimate and sustainable. In this sense, entrepreneurship becomes not only an economic practice but also a human and organizational process oriented toward sustainable growth.

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. Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-*

- performance work systems pay off*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
6. 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.
 7. Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
 8. Baumol, W. J. (1990). Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive, and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 893–921.
 9. Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A., & Ulrich, D. (2001). *The HR scorecard: Linking people, strategy, and performance*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
 10. Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40–57.
 11. Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2000). *The social life of information*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
 12. Brynjolfsson, E., & Hitt, L. M. (2000). Beyond computation: Information technology, organizational transformation and business performance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(4), 23–48.
 13. Casson, M. (1982). *The entrepreneur: An economic theory*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
 14. Choo, C. W. (1998). *The knowing organization: How organizations use information to construct meaning, create knowledge, and make decisions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 15. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128–152.
 16. 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>
 17. Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
 18. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
 19. Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. New York: Harper & Row.
 20. Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford: Capstone.
 21. Hart, S. L. (1995). A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 986–1014.
 22. Hart, S. L., & Milstein, M. B. (2003). Creating sustainable value. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(2), 56–67.
 23. 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.
 24. Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 25. Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
 26. Kooiman, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Modern governance: New government-society interactions*. London: Sage.
 27. McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
 28. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 29. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 30. Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 31. Pfeffer, J. (1994). *Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the work force*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
 32. 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.
 33. Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652–667.
 34. Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
 35. Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices. *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3), 207–219.
 36. 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.
 37. Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
 38. 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.

39. Staniewski, M. (2002). Zarządzanie wiedzą: Od koncepcji do praktyki działania. *Organizacja i Kierowanie*, 3(109), 35–48.
40. 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>
41. 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.
42. 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>
43. 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>
44. 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>
45. Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 17–28.
46. Teece, D. J. (1986). Profiting from technological innovation: Implications for integration, collaboration, licensing and public policy. *Research Policy*, 15(6), 285–305.
47. Von Hippel, E. (1988). *The sources of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
48. Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
49. Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
50. Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies: Analysis and antitrust implications: A study in the economics of internal organization*. New York: Free Press.
51. World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.