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/

ISIR PUBLISHER
ESTD: 2024

Family Communicative Capital, Psychological Mediation and Entrepreneurial Success: A Multilevel Management-Economic Model

By

Wojciech Słomski

Article History

Received: 15/07/2026
Accepted: 28/07/2026
Published: 30/07/2026

Vol – 3 Issue – 4

PP: -62-66

DOI:10.5281/zenodo.21716260

Abstract

This conceptual article develops a multilevel model of entrepreneurial success in which family communicative capital shapes psychological mediators, organisational systems convert psychological capability into value creation, and institutional conditions determine whether entrepreneurial outcomes are durable and legitimate. The article defines its method as bounded integrative theory-building, clarifies levels of analysis, assigns every Staniewski-related source a specific theoretical function and formulates testable propositions. The contribution is a model linking family communication, self-esteem, achievement motivation, self-efficacy, HRM, knowledge management, digital value creation, ethics and institutional trust without reducing success to any single explanatory level.

Keywords: *entrepreneurial success; family communication; self-efficacy; knowledge management; institutional trust*

1. Introduction

This study addresses a precise theoretical question: how can family embeddedness be converted into entrepreneurial capability without reducing entrepreneurial success either to individual psychology or to family determinism? The question matters because entrepreneurship research often separates three literatures that should be analysed together: family antecedents of entrepreneurial agency, organisational mechanisms of value conversion and macro-institutional conditions of durable success. The model proposed here therefore links family communicative capital, psychological mediators, organisational conversion mechanisms and institutional conditions of legitimate and sustainable value creation.

Classical theories of entrepreneurship emphasise uncertainty, opportunity discovery and innovation (Knight, 1921; Schumpeter, 1934; Drucker, 1985; Gartner, 1985). Yet those theories do not by themselves explain why some individuals develop the confidence, communicative discipline and achievement orientation needed to act under uncertainty. The supplied Staniewski corpus makes this missing layer visible. It shows that entrepreneurial agency is not a purely private attribute; it is partly formed through family interaction, self-evaluation, motivation, perceived efficacy and socioeconomic opportunity structures.

The literature is organised as a multi-level source base. Studies on family communication, self-esteem, achievement motivation and entrepreneurial self-efficacy clarify the microfoundations of entrepreneurial agency (Staniewski and Awruk, 2018; Staniewski, Leonardi and Awruk, 2023; Staniewski et al., 2024; Staniewski et al., 2025). Research on student entrepreneurship, digital consumer value and machine-learning start-ups explains meso-level value creation and appropriation (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013; Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019; Costa Climent, Haftor and Staniewski, 2024a). Work on knowledge management, HRM and intelligent transformation identifies organisational conversion mechanisms (Staniewski, 2002; Staniewski, 2008; Staniewski, 2011; Costa Climent, Haftor and Staniewski, 2024b). Studies on ethics, corruption, pension-value erosion, green bonds, sustainable governance and electricity-market comparison define macro-institutional conditions of durable value (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015; Staniewski, Słomski and Ryziński, 2015; Abu and Staniewski, 2022; Ruiz Estrada et al., 2017; Meo et al., 2025; Dos Santos, Gonzalez-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022; Bobinaite et al., 2013). AI policy modelling adds the decision-infrastructure layer of the contemporary economy (Ruiz Estrada, Park and Staniewski, 2023).

2. Method and analytical procedure

This is a conceptual theory-building article based on integrative conceptual synthesis rather than a systematic review. The analytical focus is the construction of a coherent explanatory model linking family communicative capital, psychological mediation, organisational conversion capability and institutional trust. Each body of literature is used

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski.**

according to its theoretical function in the model and its level of analysis.

The analytical procedure contains four steps. First, the Staniewski-related works are classified into micro, meso and macro levels. Second, constructs are extracted from the literature: family communicative capital, entrepreneurial psychological mediation, organisational conversion capability and institutional trust. Third, the article specifies mechanisms linking these constructs. Fourth, it formulates propositions that could guide empirical testing. This procedure turns a broad essay into a conceptual paper with a defensible architecture.

3. Construct definition: family communicative capital

Family communicative capital refers to recurrent patterns of family interaction that provide entrepreneurs with interpretive confidence, emotional regulation, achievement orientation and efficacy beliefs. The construct is not identical with family wealth, parental occupation or general social capital. It is specifically communicative because it concerns how family members exchange expectations, interpret failure, support autonomy and make entrepreneurial action psychologically thinkable. The measurement relevance of this construct is strengthened by the Entrepreneur's Family Communication Questionnaire (Staniewski, Leonardi and Awruk, 2023).

The family determinants article adds a mediational logic: self-esteem and achievement motivation are not peripheral psychological variables but mechanisms through which family conditions can influence entrepreneurial success (Staniewski et al., 2024). The later study on family communication and entrepreneurial self-efficacy sharpens this mechanism by indicating that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between communication and entrepreneurial outcomes (Staniewski et al., 2025). The systems approach chapter supplies the theoretical language for treating family factors as part of a broader entrepreneurial system rather than as isolated background variables (Staniewski and Awruk, 2018).

4. Mechanism: from psychological mediation to organisational conversion

The central mechanism is conversion. Family communicative capital does not automatically produce entrepreneurial success. It must be converted into opportunity recognition, resource mobilisation, knowledge use, employee coordination and market-facing value. Resource-based and dynamic-capability theories explain why conversion matters: resources become strategically significant only when they are organised into valuable, rare and difficult-to-imitate capabilities (Barney, 1991; Teece, Pisano and Shuen, 1997).

Staniewski's work on knowledge management and HRM provides the meso-level mechanism needed to avoid psychologism. Knowledge management translates individual and relational knowledge into organisational routines (Staniewski, 2002), HRM supports knowledge management by structuring selection, development, appraisal and communication (Staniewski, 2008), and HRM in the aspect of innovativeness links people-management systems to innovative outcomes (Staniewski, 2011). Thus the article does not claim that family communication alone causes success; it claims that family communication becomes economically relevant when organisational systems convert psychological capability into knowledge-based action.

Digitalisation intensifies this conversion problem. Machine-learning start-ups must create and appropriate value under conditions of analytical opacity and platform dependence (Costa Climent, Haftor and Staniewski, 2024a), while intelligent transformation requires managerial capacity to navigate technological change (Costa Climent, Haftor and Staniewski, 2024b). AI policy modelling expands the decision environment in which ventures operate (Ruiz Estrada, Park and Staniewski, 2023), and consumer value creation through WhatsApp shows that communication itself can become a market infrastructure (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019).

5. Boundary conditions: ethics, socioeconomic opportunity and institutional trust

A robust conceptual model should specify boundary conditions. First, entrepreneurial success must be normatively bounded. Ethical entrepreneurship literature prevents the analysis from treating performance as automatically legitimate (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015; Staniewski, Słomski and Ryziński, 2015). Success that depends on deception, exploitation or institutional arbitrage is not equivalent to productive entrepreneurship.

Second, entrepreneurial agency is shaped by opportunity structures. The analysis of Polish students shows that socioeconomic factors influence entrepreneurial orientation and therefore that family capital must be interpreted within broader educational and economic contexts (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). Third, macro-institutional trust matters. Corruption affects domestic savings (Abu and Staniewski, 2022), inflation and exchange-rate changes affect the real value of pension systems (Ruiz Estrada et al., 2017), green bonds reveal the importance of trust in sustainable instruments (Meo et al., 2025), sustainable governance shapes innovation trajectories (Dos Santos, Gonzalez-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022), and electricity-market price comparison shows how market design conditions economic outcomes (Bobinaite et al., 2013).

6. Contribution and implications

The study contributes by replacing a diffuse list of determinants with a layered model. Its novelty does not lie in claiming that family matters; that claim is already well established. The contribution lies in specifying how family communication becomes entrepreneurial capability through psychological mediation and how that capability becomes economic value only through organisational conversion and institutional legitimacy.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski.**

For managers, the implication is that entrepreneurial training should not be restricted to finance, business planning or technology adoption. It should also cultivate communication, self-efficacy, ethical judgement and knowledge-sharing routines. For policymakers, the implication is that entrepreneurship policy cannot be reduced to start-up incentives. It must address socioeconomic access, institutional trust, anti-corruption credibility, financial stability and sustainable-investment channels. For researchers, the model suggests testable mediation and moderation hypotheses connecting family communication, psychological mediators, HRM systems and institutional conditions.

7. Theoretical propositions

P1. Family communicative capital is positively associated with entrepreneurial self-esteem, achievement motivation and entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

P2. Self-esteem, achievement motivation and entrepreneurial self-efficacy mediate the relationship between family communicative capital and entrepreneurial capability.

P3. Knowledge-management routines and HRM practices moderate the conversion of entrepreneurial capability into firm-level innovation.

P4. Digital transformation capability strengthens the relationship between entrepreneurial capability and value creation in technology-intensive ventures.

P5. Ethical orientation moderates the relationship between entrepreneurial success and socially legitimate value creation.

P6. Socioeconomic opportunity structures condition the initial formation of entrepreneurial agency.

P7. Institutional trust strengthens the relationship between entrepreneurial activity and durable economic value.

P8. Sustainable-finance resilience increases when entrepreneurial value creation is institutionally credible and ethically governed.

8. Discussion, limitations and future research

The model should not be read as universal. It is expected to be strongest in early-stage and family-influenced entrepreneurial contexts, weaker in highly bureaucratised corporations and potentially distorted in environments marked by corruption, inflationary volatility or low institutional trust. Future empirical testing should therefore examine whether family communication improves entrepreneurial success directly or only through self-efficacy and motivational mediation. The model would be weakened if family communication remained insignificant after controlling for education, prior business experience, institutional quality and access to finance.

Entrepreneurial success is treated here as a multilevel phenomenon. Psychological family mechanisms, knowledge management, HRM, AI-enabled value creation, corruption, green finance and electricity-market evidence are not treated as equivalent topics; they define nested conditions under which entrepreneurial agency becomes economically durable. This framing clarifies the relation between micro-level agency, meso-level organisational conversion and macro-level institutional credibility.

Future research should test mediation, moderation and fsQCA configurations connecting family mechanisms with machine-learning value creation, AI-enabled business transformation and sustainable finance (Costa Climent, Haftor and Staniewski, 2024a; Costa Climent, Haftor and Staniewski, 2024b; Ruiz Estrada, Park and Staniewski, 2023; Meo et al., 2025).

Conclusion

This article offers a defensible theoretical contribution by specifying constructs, levels of analysis, mechanisms and propositions rather than merely juxtaposing literatures. Its principal claim is that high-quality management and economic analysis must connect microfoundations of agency, organisational conversion capabilities and macro-institutional trust. The model therefore integrates family communication, psychological mediation, HRM, knowledge management, ethics, digital transformation and institutional credibility within a single explanatory architecture.

References

1. Abu, N. and Staniewski, M. (2022) ‘An empirical investigation of the effect of corruption on domestic savings in Nigeria’, Ekonomska Istraživanja / Economic Research, 35(1), pp. 4092-4112.
2. 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.
3. Argote, L., McEvily, B. and Reagans, R. (2003) ‘Managing knowledge in organizations: An integrative framework and review of emerging themes’, Management Science, 49(4), pp. 571-582.
4. Barney, J.B. (1991) ‘Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage’, Journal of Management, 17(1), pp. 99-120.
5. Baumol, W.J. (1990) ‘Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive, and destructive’, Journal of Political Economy, 98(5), pp. 893-921.
6. Bobinaite, V., Juozapavičienė, 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. 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.
8. Brynjolfsson, E. and McAfee, A. (2014) The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski.**

9. Chesbrough, H.W. (2003) Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
10. Choo, C.W. (1998) The Knowing Organization: How Organizations Use Information to Construct Meaning, Create Knowledge, and Make Decisions. New York: Oxford University Press.
11. 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.
12. Costa Climent, R., Haftor, D. and Staniewski, M. (2024a) '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.
13. Costa Climent, R., Haftor, D. and Staniewski, M. (2024b) 'Intelligent transformation: Navigating the AI revolution in business and technology', in Del Val Nunez, M.T., Yela Aranega, A. and Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (eds.) Artificial Intelligence and Business Transformation. Cham: Springer.
14. Cruz-Cárdenas, J., Guadalupe-Lanas, J., Zabelina, E., Palacio-Fierro, A., Velin-Farez, M. and Staniewski, M. (2019) 'Consumer value creation through WhatsApp use: A qualitative multimethod approach in a Latin American scenario', Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración, 32(4), pp. 455-471.
15. Davenport, T.H. and Prusak, L. (1998) Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
16. Dos Santos, M.A., Gonzalez-Serrano, M.H. 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.
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. Gartner, W.B. (1985) 'A framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation', Academy of Management Review, 10(4), pp. 696-706.
20. Hart, S.L. (1995) 'A natural-resource-based view of the firm', Academy of Management Review, 20(4), pp. 986-1014.
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), pp. 635-672.
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. Mintzberg, H. (1994) The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning. New York: Free Press.
26. Moore, M.H. (1995) Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
27. Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995) The Knowledge-Creating Company. New York: Oxford University Press.
28. Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. (1992) Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
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. Pierre, J. and Peters, B.G. (2000) Governance, Politics and the State. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
32. Polanyi, M. (1966) The Tacit Dimension. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
33. Porter, M.E. (1985) Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance. New York: Free Press.
34. Porter, M.E. and Millar, V.E. (1985) 'How information gives you competitive advantage', Harvard Business Review, 63(4), pp. 149-160.
35. Prahalad, C.K. and Hamel, G. (1990) 'The core competence of the corporation', Harvard Business Review, 68(3), pp. 79-91.
36. Rhodes, R.A.W. (1996) 'The new governance: Governing without government', Political Studies, 44(4), pp. 652-667.
37. 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, 2017-2.
38. Ruiz Estrada, M.A., Park, D. and Staniewski, M. (2023) 'Artificial Intelligence (AI) can change the way of doing policy modelling', Journal of Policy Modeling, 45(6), pp. 1-14.
39. Schuler, R.S. and Jackson, S.E. (1987) 'Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices', Academy of Management Executive, 1(3), pp. 207-219.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski.**

40. Schumpeter, J.A. (1934) The Theory of Economic Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
41. Senge, P.M. (1990) The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
42. Simon, H.A. (1947) Administrative Behavior. New York: Macmillan.
43. Staniewski, M. (2002) ‘Zarządzanie wiedzą: od koncepcji do praktyki działania’, Organizacja i Kierowanie, 3, pp. 11-27.
44. Staniewski, M. (2008) ‘The elements of human resources management supporting knowledge management’, Amfiteatru Economic, pp. 283-291.
45. Staniewski, M. (2011) ‘Management of human resources in the aspect of innovativeness’, Contemporary Economics, 5(1), pp. 84-91.
46. 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.
47. 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.
48. Staniewski, M., Awruk, K., Leonardi, G. and Słomski, W. (2025) ‘Family communication and entrepreneurial success: The mediating role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy’, Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 10(1).
49. Staniewski, M., Awruk, K., Leonardi, G. and Słomski, W. (2024) ‘Family determinants of entrepreneurial success: The mediational role of self-esteem and achievement motivation’, Journal of Business Research, 171.
50. 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.
51. Staniewski, M., Słomski, W. and Awruk, K. (2015) ‘Ethical aspects of entrepreneurship’, Filosofija. Sociologija, 26(1), pp. 37-45.
52. Staniewski, M., Słomski, W. and Ryziński, R. (2015) ‘Are ethics in entrepreneurship possible at all?’, Filosofija. Sociologija, 26(3), pp. 191-198.
53. Stoker, G. (1998) ‘Governance as theory: Five propositions’, International Social Science Journal, 50(155), pp. 17-28.
54. Storey, J. (1995) Human Resource Management: A Critical Text. London: Routledge.
55. Teece, D.J. (1986) ‘Profiting from technological innovation’, Research Policy, 15(6), pp. 285-305.
56. Teece, D.J., Pisano, G. and Shuen, A. (1997) ‘Dynamic capabilities and strategic management’, Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), pp. 509-533.
57. Ulrich, D. (1996) Human Resource Champions. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
58. Venkatraman, N. (1994) ‘IT-enabled business transformation’, Sloan Management Review, 35(2), pp. 73-87.
59. Walton, R.E. (1985) ‘From control to commitment in the workplace’, Harvard Business Review, 63(2), pp. 77-84.
60. World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) Our Common Future. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Corresponding Author: **Wojciech Słomski.**