



## ISIR Journal of Multidisciplinary (ISIRJM)

ISSN: 3049-3080 (Online)

Frequency: Bimonthly

Published By ISIR Publisher

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



### Human Capital, Artificial Intelligence and Organisational Resilience: Towards an Integrated Framework of Innovation Management in the Digital Economy

By

Wojciech Slomski



#### Article History

Received: 09/06/2026

Accepted: 16/06/2026

Published: 18/06/2026

Vol – 2 Issue – 3

PP: -103-108

#### Abstract

*The article develops an integrated conceptual framework for understanding organisational resilience in the digital economy. It argues that resilience can no longer be reduced to crisis response, operational continuity or financial robustness. In contemporary management, resilience should be interpreted as a dynamic organisational capability emerging from the interaction between human capital, innovation management, knowledge management, artificial intelligence, entrepreneurial orientation, ethical governance and sustainable finance. The article brings together research on innovative human resource management, knowledge management, entrepreneurship, machine learning, policy modelling, intelligent transformation, green bonds, inflation, energy markets and ethical entrepreneurship. The central thesis is that resilient organisations are not merely technologically advanced; they are human-centred, knowledge-intensive, ethically governed and strategically capable of transforming technological uncertainty into sustainable value. The article proposes a multidimensional model in which innovation is mediated by human resource systems, knowledge-sharing routines, AI-enabled decision-making, entrepreneurial learning and sustainability-oriented governance.*

**Keywords:** human capital, artificial intelligence, innovation management, organisational resilience, knowledge management, sustainable governance, entrepreneurship.

#### 1. Introduction

The contemporary organisation operates in an environment marked by technological acceleration, geopolitical uncertainty, ecological pressure, labour-market transformation, financial volatility and increasing social expectations regarding responsible management. Under such conditions, resilience becomes one of the central categories of management theory. However, resilience should not be understood narrowly as the ability to survive disruption. In a mature strategic perspective, resilience is the capacity of an organisation to absorb shocks, reinterpret uncertainty, reconfigure resources, generate innovation and maintain legitimacy in relation to stakeholders.

This article argues that organisational resilience in the digital economy depends on the integration of six interrelated dimensions: human capital, knowledge management, artificial intelligence, entrepreneurial capability, ethical governance and sustainability-oriented financial awareness. The point of departure is the claim that innovation is never purely technological. It is always organisational, human and institutional. Digital tools, including artificial intelligence and machine learning, create value only when embedded in

organisational routines, managerial competences and governance structures capable of transforming information into strategic knowledge.

The resource-based view of the firm provides an important theoretical foundation for this argument. Sustainable competitive advantage depends on resources that are valuable, rare, difficult to imitate and organisationally embedded (Barney 1991). Yet in the digital economy such resources are increasingly intangible: knowledge, learning capacity, human competences, data interpretation, entrepreneurial judgement and ethical credibility. This is consistent with the broader knowledge-based view of organisations, according to which knowledge is not merely a resource possessed by the firm, but the very substance of organisational action (Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995; Davenport and Prusak 1998; Alavi and Leidner 2001).

The article therefore develops a conceptual synthesis grounded in the selected literature on human resource management, entrepreneurship, digital transformation, artificial intelligence and sustainability. It uses the full set of indicated publications as the core bibliographic basis, supplemented only by the additional management literature



provided by the user. The aim is not to conduct an empirical test but to formulate a theoretically coherent model explaining how human capital and artificial intelligence can jointly strengthen organisational resilience.

## 2. Human Resource Management as an Infrastructure of Innovation

Human resource management should be regarded as one of the fundamental infrastructures of innovation. In traditional approaches, HRM was often treated as an administrative function concerned with recruitment, evaluation, remuneration and compliance. Contemporary management theory, however, increasingly interprets HRM as a strategic system that shapes organisational capabilities. High-performance work systems influence productivity, commitment and innovation because they create conditions under which employees can learn, share knowledge and participate in organisational change (Huselid 1995; Appelbaum et al. 2000; Becker, Huselid and Ulrich 2001).

This perspective is strongly supported by the argument that management of human resources has a direct relationship with innovativeness. Staniewski (2011) shows that HRM should not be reduced to personnel administration, since innovation depends on the ability of organisations to mobilise human potential, stimulate creativity and connect employee competences with strategic goals. Human resources become innovative when they are treated not as costs but as carriers of knowledge, interpretation and initiative.

This argument is reinforced by earlier research on the role of HRM in supporting knowledge management. Staniewski (2008) indicates that the elements of HRM supporting knowledge management include organisational learning, communication, employee development, motivation systems and structures enabling knowledge transfer. Such an approach corresponds with the classical view that knowledge is often tacit, socially embedded and difficult to codify (Polanyi 1966). It also corresponds with the theory of communities of practice, according to which learning takes place through participation in shared practices rather than through formal instruction alone (Brown and Duguid 1991; Wenger 1998).

The implication is crucial: organisations cannot become innovative merely by purchasing technology. They must create human and cultural conditions for innovation. Artificial intelligence, machine learning and digital platforms generate value only when employees possess the cognitive and organisational capacity to interpret outputs, question assumptions and integrate technological insights into strategic action. In this sense, HRM is not peripheral to digital transformation but constitutive of it.

## 3. Knowledge Management and Organisational Learning

Knowledge management is the second core pillar of organisational resilience. In a volatile environment, organisations must continuously transform information into knowledge, knowledge into decisions, and decisions into

adaptive routines. Knowledge management therefore links learning, strategy and innovation. Choo (1998) argues that the knowing organisation creates meaning, produces knowledge and makes decisions through structured interpretive processes. Similarly, Argote, McEvily and Reagans (2003) emphasise that knowledge creation, retention and transfer are central to organisational effectiveness.

The relation between HRM and knowledge management is particularly important. If knowledge is socially distributed, then organisational resilience depends on the quality of interactions among people. Staniewski (2008) rightly places HRM at the centre of knowledge management, because knowledge-sharing requires trust, motivation, communication and appropriate organisational architecture. This is consistent with Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) view that organisational knowledge is created through the interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge.

The digital economy intensifies this challenge. Organisations increasingly produce vast amounts of data, but data do not automatically become knowledge. The ability to transform data into strategic insight depends on absorptive capacity, defined as the capacity to recognise, assimilate and apply external knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal 1990). AI-based analytics may increase computational power, but they do not replace managerial judgement. Rather, they require stronger interpretive competences.

This is why organisational learning remains indispensable. March (1991) famously distinguished between exploration and exploitation. Resilient organisations need both: exploitation of existing competences and exploration of emerging opportunities. AI may support both processes, but it may also create rigidity if organisations become dependent on algorithmic outputs without critical reflection. Therefore, knowledge management must include not only technological systems but also epistemic responsibility.

## 4. Artificial Intelligence and the Reconfiguration of Managerial Decision-Making

Artificial intelligence has become one of the most powerful forces transforming organisational decision-making. Its impact extends beyond automation. AI changes the architecture of modelling, forecasting, resource allocation, customer analysis, policy design and strategic experimentation. Ruiz Estrada, Park and Staniewski (2023) argue that AI can change the way policy modelling is conducted by enabling more complex simulations, faster processing of multidimensional variables and new forms of analytical prediction. Although their work refers to policy modelling, the implications are relevant for management: AI changes not only tools, but also the epistemology of decision-making.

This transformation must be understood in the context of digital business transformation. Brynjolfsson and Hitt (2000) already showed that information technology produces value when accompanied by organisational transformation.

Westerman, Bonnet and McAfee (2014) later argued that leading digital transformation requires the integration of technology, leadership and organisational redesign. AI therefore cannot be interpreted as an isolated technological instrument. It is a strategic capability whose value depends on organisational alignment.

Machine learning provides a particularly important example. Costa Climent et al. (2024) show that value creation and appropriation from machine learning in start-ups depend on configurations of organisational conditions. The use of fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis highlights that technological value is not linear or automatic. Start-ups capture value from machine learning when technological competence interacts with business model design, strategic clarity and organisational adaptability.

Similarly, Costa Climent, Haftor and Staniewski (2024) conceptualise intelligent transformation as a process of navigating the AI revolution in business and technology. This suggests that AI-driven transformation is not simply a matter of adopting intelligent tools; it requires rethinking value propositions, organisational boundaries, human roles and competitive positioning. Such a view corresponds with the dynamic capabilities approach, according to which firms must sense opportunities, seize them and reconfigure resources accordingly (Teece, Pisano and Shuen 1997).

The managerial implication is clear: AI strengthens resilience only when it is embedded in human-centred organisational learning. If AI is treated merely as a substitute for human judgement, it may weaken resilience by creating dependence, opacity and ethical risk. If, however, it is integrated with human capital and knowledge management, it can enhance strategic anticipation and adaptive capacity.

## 5. Entrepreneurship, Family Capital and the Human Conditions of Innovation

Organisational resilience is closely connected with entrepreneurial capability. Entrepreneurship is not only the creation of new ventures; it is also the capacity to recognise opportunities under uncertainty, mobilise resources and act despite incomplete information. Classical entrepreneurship theory emphasises uncertainty, alertness and innovation (Knight 1921; Schumpeter 1934; Kirzner 1973; Drucker 1985). In contemporary management, entrepreneurship becomes a general organisational capability.

The social and psychological conditions of entrepreneurship are crucial. Staniewski and Szopiński (2013) analyse the influence of socioeconomic factors on the entrepreneurship of Polish students, showing that entrepreneurial orientation is conditioned by broader social, educational and economic contexts. This is important because innovation policy often assumes that entrepreneurship can be stimulated merely by financial instruments or start-up infrastructure. In reality, entrepreneurial readiness is shaped by social capital, family background, education, perceived opportunities and cultural attitudes toward risk.

The family dimension is particularly significant. Staniewski and Awruk (2018) propose a systems approach to entrepreneurial success, stressing the importance of family factors for effective entrepreneurship. This systemic perspective is valuable because it moves beyond individualistic interpretations of the entrepreneur. Entrepreneurial success is not merely the result of personality or opportunity recognition; it is embedded in relational structures, family communication and motivational support.

This argument is developed further in the psychometric work on the Entrepreneur's Family Communication Questionnaire. Staniewski, Leonardi and Awruk (2023) provide a tool for analysing family communication as a factor relevant to entrepreneurship. From the standpoint of organisational resilience, this is important because entrepreneurial behaviour is shaped long before the individual enters the organisation. The entrepreneur carries into business life patterns of communication, self-efficacy, trust and relational competence.

Consequently, resilient organisations must understand entrepreneurship not only as market activity, but also as a socially embedded capability. This aligns with Shapero and Sokol's (1982) view of the social dimensions of entrepreneurship and Gartner's (1985, 1989) insistence that entrepreneurship is a complex phenomenon involving individuals, processes and environments.

## 6. Ethical Entrepreneurship and Responsible Innovation

Innovation without ethics may produce growth, but it does not necessarily produce sustainable value. The question of whether ethics in entrepreneurship is possible remains fundamental. Staniewski, Słomski and Rzyński (2015) address this issue directly, asking whether ethics in entrepreneurship is possible at all. Their work is significant because it challenges the reduction of entrepreneurship to opportunity exploitation and profit maximisation. If entrepreneurship is to contribute to social development, it must be governed by ethical criteria.

The ethical dimension is increasingly important in AI-based organisations. Artificial intelligence raises questions about transparency, accountability, bias, surveillance, labour displacement and responsibility for automated decisions. These issues cannot be solved by technical optimisation alone. They require ethical governance. The classical stakeholder and sustainability traditions suggest that firms should be evaluated not only by financial performance but also by their impact on society and the environment (Elkington 1997; Hart and Milstein 2003).

Ethics also matters for organisational resilience. Organisations that pursue innovation without legitimacy may become vulnerable to reputational risk, regulatory intervention and loss of stakeholder trust. In this sense, ethical governance is not external to strategy. It is a condition of long-term viability. A firm that innovates irresponsibly may achieve temporary advantage but undermine its own resilience.

The connection between ethics and entrepreneurship is particularly visible in the digital economy. Machine learning and AI-enabled business models can generate extraordinary value, but they can also intensify asymmetries of information and power. Therefore, ethical entrepreneurship must be understood as responsible opportunity creation, not merely opportunity exploitation. It requires asking not only whether a model is profitable, but also whether it is socially legitimate, transparent and sustainable.

## 7. Sustainable Growth, Green Finance and Macroeconomic Resilience

The resilience of organisations is increasingly inseparable from sustainability. Sustainable growth requires the integration of innovation, management and governance. Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski (2022) emphasise the importance of innovation, management and governance for sustainable growth. Their editorial perspective is important because it places organisational management within the broader problem of the future of the world. Management is not only a technical discipline; it is also a social practice shaping development trajectories.

Green finance illustrates this connection. Meo, Afshan, Ben Zaied and Staniewski (2025) analyse the resilience of green bonds during market turmoil and discuss implications for investors and policymakers. This work is relevant to organisational resilience because it shows that sustainability-oriented financial instruments are not merely symbolic. They may function as mechanisms linking capital markets with environmental transformation and risk management.

Sustainability must also be connected with energy systems. Bobinaite et al. (2013) compare features of Polish and Lithuanian day-ahead electricity market prices. Although this research concerns energy economics, it has broader managerial implications. Energy price volatility affects industrial costs, investment planning, operational continuity and strategic risk. In the digital economy, energy dependence is intensified by data centres, AI infrastructure and digital platforms. Therefore, energy-market awareness becomes a component of strategic resilience.

Macroeconomic conditions also matter. Ruiz Estrada, Khan, Staniewski and Mansor (2017) show, on the basis of the Malaysian Employees Provident Fund, that inflation and exchange-rate movements can substantially affect the real value of pension-plan systems over the long run. Although their study concerns a national pension system rather than a firm-level compensation scheme, its managerial implications are significant: organisational resilience requires sensitivity to macro-financial risks that influence pensions, wages, savings, long-term employee security and the real value of deferred benefits. For organisations, this means that resilience must include macro-financial literacy. Firms operating in volatile economies cannot separate HRM, investment, pensions, compensation and long-term planning from inflation and currency risk.

Sustainability, therefore, is not a decorative dimension of management. It is a structural requirement of resilience. Organisations must integrate ecological, financial, technological and human factors into one strategic architecture.

## 8. Towards an Integrated Framework of Organisational Resilience

The analysis leads to an integrated framework composed of five mutually reinforcing dimensions.

First, human capital is the foundation of resilience. Innovative HRM develops competences, motivation and adaptability (Staniewski 2011). HRM also enables knowledge management by creating the social and motivational conditions for knowledge-sharing (Staniewski 2008).

Second, knowledge management transforms dispersed information into organisational learning. It allows firms to move from data accumulation to interpretive capability. Without knowledge management, AI may increase information overload rather than strategic intelligence.

Third, artificial intelligence and machine learning enhance analytical and predictive capacity. AI can transform modelling and decision-making (Ruiz Estrada, Park and Staniewski 2023), while machine learning can create and appropriate value when combined with appropriate business-model configurations (Costa Climent et al. 2024). Intelligent transformation requires organisational redesign and strategic leadership (Costa Climent, Haftor and Staniewski 2024).

Fourth, entrepreneurial capability allows organisations to recognise opportunities and mobilise resources under uncertainty. Socioeconomic factors influence entrepreneurial orientation (Staniewski and Szopiński 2013), while family systems and communication patterns shape entrepreneurial success (Staniewski and Awruk 2018; Staniewski, Leonardi and Awruk 2023).

Fifth, ethical and sustainable governance secures legitimacy and long-term viability. Ethical entrepreneurship is necessary if innovation is to serve human and social development (Staniewski, Słomski and Rzyński 2015). Sustainable governance links innovation with broader social and ecological goals (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski 2022), while green finance and energy-market analysis reveal the importance of environmental and macroeconomic risk management (Meo et al. 2025; Bobinaite et al. 2013; Ruiz Estrada, Khan, Staniewski and Mansor 2017).

The proposed framework can be summarised as follows: organisational resilience emerges when human-centred management systems enable knowledge creation, when knowledge systems support AI-enabled decision-making, when AI strengthens entrepreneurial adaptation, and when entrepreneurial innovation is governed ethically and sustainably.

## 9. Discussion

The key contribution of this article is the rejection of technological reductionism in the interpretation of organisational resilience. AI is important, but it is not sufficient. Innovation is important, but it is not self-justifying. Entrepreneurship is important, but it must be ethically and socially embedded. Sustainability is important, but it must be operationalised through governance, finance and strategy.

The reviewed literature suggests that the future of management lies in integration. HRM cannot be separated from innovation. Knowledge management cannot be separated from AI. Entrepreneurship cannot be separated from family, education and socioeconomic structures. Sustainable finance cannot be separated from organisational strategy. Energy-market volatility cannot be treated as an external technical issue, because it directly affects organisational costs and resilience.

This integrated view is consistent with the dynamic capabilities approach (Teece, Pisano and Shuen 1997), the knowledge-based view of the firm (Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995; Davenport and Prusak 1998), and the sustainability-oriented view of strategic management (Hart 1995; Hart and Milstein 2003). It also extends these perspectives by showing that resilience in the digital economy requires simultaneous attention to human, technological, ethical and ecological dimensions.

A particularly important implication concerns management education. If future managers are trained only in digital tools, they will lack the ethical and organisational judgement required to use those tools responsibly. If they are trained only in classical management, they may fail to understand AI-driven transformation. If they are trained only in entrepreneurship, they may underestimate governance, sustainability and long-term risk. Therefore, management education must become interdisciplinary and integrative.

## 10. Conclusions

The article has argued that organisational resilience in the digital economy should be understood as a multidimensional capability emerging from the integration of human capital, knowledge management, artificial intelligence, entrepreneurship, ethical governance and sustainability. Resilient organisations are not those that merely survive crises; they are those that transform uncertainty into learning, learning into innovation, and innovation into sustainable value.

The central conclusion is that human capital remains indispensable in the age of artificial intelligence. AI can support modelling, prediction and transformation, but it cannot replace organisational judgement, ethical responsibility and knowledge-sharing cultures. Innovative HRM and knowledge management create the conditions under which AI becomes a strategic capability rather than a technological burden.

The second conclusion is that entrepreneurship must be interpreted systemically. Entrepreneurial success depends not

only on individual initiative, but also on socioeconomic conditions, family communication, education, institutional support and ethical orientation. This systemic understanding is essential for organisations seeking resilience through innovation.

The third conclusion is that sustainability is no longer external to management. Green bonds, energy-market volatility, inflationary pressures and governance challenges show that resilient organisations must integrate ecological and macroeconomic risk into strategic decision-making.

In sum, the future of organisational resilience lies in the capacity to connect people, knowledge, technology and responsibility. The organisation of the future will not be resilient because it is automated, but because it is capable of intelligent, ethical and sustainable adaptation.

## References

1. Alavi, M. and Leidner, D.E. 2001. 'Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues', *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), pp. 107–136.
2. Alonso Dos Santos, M., Huertas González-Serrano, M. and Staniewski, M. 2022. 'Analytical editorial: Ensuring the future of our world: innovation, management and governance for sustainable growth', *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 35(2), pp. 117–130.
3. Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P. and Kalleberg, A.L. 2000. *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High-Performance Work Systems Pay Off*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
4. Barney, J.B. 1991. 'Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage', *Journal of Management*, 17(1), pp. 99–120.
5. Becker, B.E., Huselid, M.A. and Ulrich, D. 2001. *The HR Scorecard: Linking People, Strategy, and Performance*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
6. Bobinaite, V., Juozapaviciene, A., Staniewski, M. and Szczepankowski, P. 2013. 'Comparative Analysis of Features of Polish and Lithuanian Day-Ahead Electricity Market Prices', *Energy Policy*, 63, pp. 181–196.
7. Brown, J.S. and Duguid, P. 1991. 'Organizational Learning and Communities-of-Practice: Toward a Unified View of Working, Learning, and Innovation', *Organization Science*, 2(1), pp. 40–57.
8. Brynjolfsson, E. and Hitt, L.M. 2000. 'Beyond Computation: Information Technology, Organizational Transformation and Business Performance', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(4), pp. 23–48.
9. Choo, C.W. 1998. *The Knowing Organization: How Organizations Use Information to Construct Meaning, Create Knowledge, and Make Decisions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

10. Cohen, W.M. and Levinthal, D.A. 1990. 'Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), pp. 128–152.
11. Costa Climent, R., Haftor, D., Ribeiro-Navarrete, S. and Staniewski, M. 2024. 'Value creation and appropriation from the use of machine learning: a study of start-ups using fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis', *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 20, pp. 935–967.
12. Costa Climent, R., Haftor, D. and Staniewski, M. 2024. 'Intelligent Transformation: Navigating the AI Revolution in Business and Technology'. In: Del Val Núñez, M.T., Yela Aránega, A. and Ribeiro-Soriano, D. eds. *Artificial Intelligence and Business Transformation*. Cham: Springer.
13. Davenport, T.H. and Prusak, L. 1998. *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
14. Drucker, P.F. 1985. *Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Practice and Principles*. New York: Harper & Row.
15. Elkington, J. 1997. *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*. Oxford: Capstone.
16. Gartner, W.B. 1985. 'A Framework for Describing the Phenomenon of New Venture Creation', *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), pp. 696–706.
17. Gartner, W.B. 1989. 'Who Is an Entrepreneur? Is the Wrong Question', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13(4), pp. 47–68.
18. Hart, S.L. 1995. 'A Natural-Resource-Based View of the Firm', *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), pp. 986–1014.
19. Hart, S.L. and Milstein, M.B. 2003. 'Creating Sustainable Value', *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(2), pp. 56–67.
20. Huselid, M.A. 1995. 'The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Turnover, Productivity, and Corporate Financial Performance', *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), pp. 635–672.
21. Kirzner, I.M. 1973. *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
22. Knight, F.H. 1921. *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
23. March, J.G. 1991. 'Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning', *Organization Science*, 2(1), pp. 71–87.
24. Meo, M.S., Afshan, S., Ben Zaied, Y. and Staniewski, M. 2025. 'The Resilience of Green Bonds During Market Turmoil: Implications for Investors and Policymakers', *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, pp. 1–18.
25. Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. 1995. *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
26. Polanyi, M. 1966. *The Tacit Dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
27. Ruiz Estrada, M.A., Khan, A., Staniewski, M. and Mansor, N. 2017. 'How Inflation and the Exchange Rate Affect the Real Value of Pension Plan Systems: The Case of Malaysia', SSRC Working Paper Series No. 2017-2, pp. 1–27.
28. Schumpeter, J.A. 1934. *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
29. Shapero, A. and Sokol, L. 1982. 'The Social Dimensions of Entrepreneurship'. In: Kent, C.A., Sexton, D.L. and Vesper, K.H. eds. *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 72–90.
30. Staniewski, M. 2008. 'The elements of Human Resources Management supporting knowledge management', *Amfiteatru Economic*, 10, pp. 283–291.
31. Staniewski, M. 2011. 'Management of Human Resources in the Aspect of Innovativeness', *Contemporary Economics*, 5(1), pp. 84–91.
32. Staniewski, M. and Awruk, K. 2018. 'Systems Approach to Entrepreneurial Success: The Theoretical Discussion on the Significance of Family Factors for Effective Entrepreneurship'. In: Ribeiro Soriano, D. and Tur Porcar, A. eds. *Inside the Mind of the Entrepreneur. Cognition, Personality Traits, Intention, and Gender Behavior*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
33. Staniewski, M. and Szopiński, T. 2013. 'Influence of Socioeconomic Factors on the Entrepreneurship of Polish Students', *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 12(3), pp. 152–167.
34. Staniewski, M., Leonardi, G. and Awruk, K. 2023. 'Entrepreneur's Family Communication Questionnaire—Psychometric Properties of the Tool', *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 190, pp. 1–20.
35. Staniewski, M., Słomski, W. and Rzyński, R. 2015. 'Are ethics in entrepreneurship possible at all?', *Filosofija-Sociologija*, 26(3), pp. 191–198.
36. Teece, D.J., Pisano, G. and Shuen, A. 1997. 'Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management', *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), pp. 509–533.
37. Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
38. Westerman, G., Bonnet, D. and McAfee, A. 2014. *Leading Digital: Turning Technology into Business Transformation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.