



Parental attitudes and entrepreneurial success

Marcin Waldemar Staniewski^{*}, Katarzyna Awruk

University of Economics and Human Science in Warsaw, 59 Okopowa Str., 01-043 Warsaw, Poland

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Parental attitudes
Structure of family system
Entrepreneurial success

ABSTRACT

For many years, researchers have been interested in learning about factors that influence the accomplishment of entrepreneurial success. Thus far, their attention has been directed towards organizational and psychological factors, whereas family factors have been given little consideration. The objective of this study is to verify the influence of family factors, understood as parental attitudes and the structure of one's family of origin, on the achievement of entrepreneurial success. Research has been conducted on a group of 64 entrepreneurs who have run successful businesses in Poland. The following tools were used: the Questionnaire of Entrepreneurial Success, the Questionnaire of the Retrospective Assessment of Parental Attitudes, the Flexibility and Cohesion Evaluation Scales, and a personal details datasheet. Negative correlations have been identified among various parental attitudes, such as excessive demands and inconsistency and entrepreneurial success. Furthermore, the manner of communication among the members of the family of origin and the degree of satisfaction with family life have emerged as important factors in entrepreneurial success. However, no significant correlations have been found between entrepreneurial success and parental attitudes (i.e., acceptance, autonomy) or dimensions of family structure (cohesion and flexibility).

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurial success is a widely studied phenomenon (Alroaia & Baharun, 2018; Angel, Jenkins, & Stephens, 2018; Berge & Pires, 2019; Constantinidis, Lebègue, El Abboubi, & Salman, 2019; González Sánchez, 2018; Makhbul & Hasun, 2010; Overall & Wise, 2016; Razmus & Laguna, 2018; Staniewski & Awruk, 2018; Torres Marín, 2020). It seems particularly intriguing (from both a theoretical and practical point of view) to learn about the factors that could influence the achievement of such success. The literature has extensively elaborated on the precise role of sociodemographic and organizational factors (including gender, education, age (Kalleberg & Leicht, 1991), managerial skills (including the effectiveness of decision-making process), knowledge, experience, marital status, region, country of birth, macro-economic variables such as unemployment and GDP (Abu et al., 2014; Agarwal & Dahm, 2015; Green & Pryde, 1989; Joon, 2018; Sassetti, Cavaliere, & Lombardi, 2019), infrastructure, initial funds, company location, economic support or time devoted to the business), social skills (Baron & Markman, 2003; Baron & Tang, 2009), supportive factors (financial support; family moral support; social structure: family and social life; supportive government policies) (Shakeel, Yaokuang, & Gohar, 2020; Welsh & Kaciak, 2019) and psychological factors

(including personality traits, self-esteem, sense of self-efficacy, social support networks or passion) in successful business activity. Interestingly, undoubtedly less attention has been devoted to studying the influence of the family of origin on the accomplishment of business success by an entrepreneur in the future. This phenomenon is intriguing, since the family environment (i.e., parental attitudes, communication, and family structure) is one of the most significant factors shaping the “psychological constructs” of, for instance, self-esteem (Biernat, 2016), body image (Crespo, Kielpikowski, Jose, & Pryor, 2010; Curtis & Loomans, 2014; Francisco, Narciso, & Alarcão, 2013; Vincent & McCabe, 2000), beliefs or personality traits (Nakao, Takaishi, Tatsuta, Katayama, Iwase, Yorifuji, & Takeda, 2000). For example, self-esteem is largely shaped by the family environment. It is the parents who contribute to the development of high self-esteem in a child by putting trust in him or her, sending positive messages, showing affection, avoiding excessive criticism, reinforcing positive traits in a child, listening to the child carefully, praising the child (but also offering constructive criticism), and setting clear and precise rules (Ryś, 2011). In addition, the level of self-esteem is highly dependent on the family environment—that is, the support one receives or messages one hears about oneself (Biernat, 2016). According to Coopersmith (1967), three fundamental conditions for shaping positive self-esteem are as follows: the unconditional

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: m.staniewski@vizja.pl (M.W. Staniewski), k.awruk@vizja.pl (K. Awruk).

acceptance of the child, clearly set boundaries in a relationship with the child (which are respected), and an attitude of respect and tolerance towards the child. In contrast, excessive strictness of the parents, overly high expectations for the child, an autocratic parenting style, overly rigid rules, a lack of respect for the child's opinion, comparisons of the child with his or her peers, and a lack of acknowledgement, criticism, punishment, structure, and messages that protect and help the child can contribute to shaping low self-esteem. Thus, the set of family variables, which account for the creation of a self-image, together form the notion of a parental attitude. The psychological literature indicates that the way in which a parent approaches a child and forms a relationship with the child generally shapes five attitudes presented by the parents: acceptance/rejection, demands, autonomy, inconsistency, and protection. Their configuration may, in turn, be a factor that potentially enhances or suppresses a child's development. It may thus be assumed that parental attitudes serve as one of the ways in which parents exert influence. The two other ways of exerting influence are communication among family members and modeling. There are, therefore, three ways in which parents exert influence (parental attitudes/attachment style, communication, and modeling). Unfortunately, the authors currently have no knowledge of the contribution of each of these methods to entrepreneurial success. It is also unknown which of these methods may be critical for entrepreneurial success. This issue has already been described in a previous study (Staniewski & Awruk, 2018).

This study focuses mainly on two ways of exerting influence in a family (i.e., parental attitudes and communication). The researchers were primarily interested in verifying whether there are any correlations between the family system and entrepreneurial success. They wanted to determine whether communication in a family, understood as the ability to express one's own opinions, share one's opinions with family members, and express constructive criticism, may produce an impact on achieving entrepreneurial success in the future. Furthermore, the researchers were interested in the influence of parental attitudes on the achievement of success. Thus, they intended to verify whether attitudes of acceptance and autonomy may serve as a "psychological" resource base for future entrepreneurial success and whether "destructive" attitudes (i.e., attitudes reflecting excessive demands, inconsistency, and overprotection) may contribute to suppressing effective entrepreneurship. Hence, the aim of the study was to examine the importance of two methods of exerting family influence (i.e., parental attitudes and communication) on entrepreneurial success while simultaneously focusing on the attitudes that may have a relatively "protective" influence on the achievement of success, as well as on those whose influence may potentially be "threatening". In other words, the main objective of the study was to analyze the relationships between parental attitudes and entrepreneurial success and to explore the significance of the impact of the family of origin on entrepreneurial success.

The article consists of three parts. The first part presents a literature review focused on factors related to entrepreneurial success (including the influence of family variables). The second part presents the methodology of our own research along with the obtained results. The paper concludes with a discussion of the results in relation to the current state of knowledge.

2. Literature review

In the psychological literature, family is understood as "[...] a complex structure composed of mutually dependent groups of people who share the same story, experience some level of emotional bond, and introduce interaction strategies needed by individual family members and the group as a whole" (Plopa, 2015, p. 15). Family is composed of "[...] people related in biological terms, by marriage, social custom or adoption" (Burke & Green-glass, 1987, p. 15). Therefore, a family is a system in which a human being grows up, receives support (whether emotional, economic or instrumental) and develops his or her resources. Family is the institution that shapes our beliefs about ourselves, the world, and people. As Plopa

describes (2015, p. 243), "[...] the patterns of interaction between the parent and the child are the main factor stabilizing or distorting the development of the fundamental mental structures of a child. Research clearly indicates that parents who are happy in their close relationship are sensitive to the child's developmental needs and create an atmosphere in a family that allows the child to optimally exploit his or her own resources and build his or her own identity in a mature way."

Family influences people through three "mechanisms": modeling processes, the parent-child relationship (parental attitudes of mothers and fathers), and communication. With respect to the modeling processes, it has been demonstrated that people whose parents are entrepreneurs are more eager to follow this type of a career path (i.e., self-employment) than people with no such role models (Bosma, Hessels, Schutjens, Praag, & Verheul, 2012; Davidsson & Honig, 2003; Hoffmann, Junge, & Malchow-Møller, 2015; Laspita, Breugst, Heblich & Patzelt, 2012; Mungai & Velamuri, 2011; Oren, Caduri, & Tziner, 2013; Pablo-Lerchundi, Morales-Alonso, & González-Tirados, 2015; Pablo Lerchundi, Morales Alonso, & Vargas Pérez, 2014; Scott & Twomey, 1988; Wang & Wong, 2004; Schmitt-Rodermund, 2004). Such relationships have been examined in numerous countries, e.g., the UK (Taylor, 2001), the USA (Dunn & Holtz-Eakin, 2000), and Germany (Carroll & Mosakowski, 1987). Moreover, we know that having self-employed parents has a positive effect on entrepreneurial success (Obschonka, Duckworth, Silbereisen, & Schoon, 2012).

It has also been demonstrated that having an entrepreneur as a parent increases the probability that the child will also become an entrepreneur by age 30 to 200% (Andersson & Hammarstedt, 2010, 2011; Arum & Müller, 2009; Colombier & Masclat, 2008; Dunn & Holtz-Eakin (2000); Lindquist, Sol, & Van Praag, 2015). The status and effectiveness of the parents as entrepreneurs influences the intentions and entrepreneurial attitudes of the children as well (Bandura, 1986; Krumboltz, Michael & Jones, 1976). Studies have shown that the power of the influence of parents who are entrepreneurs differs depending on the period in which their children grow up (Bandura, 1986; Krumboltz et al., 1976), and it seems obvious that the more extensive and successful the parents' business is, the greater the abovementioned influence is (i.e., the children are more likely to become entrepreneurs themselves) (Hundley, 2006).

Parents can also provide their children with a (negative) role model, particularly if they fail in conducting their business or even if it involves numerous difficulties, such as low income, low prestige or low satisfaction (Mungai & Velamuri, 2011). Children of such parents will be less likely to choose self-employment than will other children with no such role model (Galambos & Silbereisen, 1987). This correlation is not present when the child goes through the period of early adulthood (Mungai & Velamuri, 2011). However, other studies have shown that parents have the greatest influence on their children's values in their adolescence and early adulthood (Turner & Lapan, 2002; Whiston & Keller, 2004); for example, the study by Mungai and Velamuri (2011) shows that the strongest influence is observable when the children are between 18 and 21 years old.

The researchers of the entrepreneurial parental role model have more often been focused on studying the influence of one of the parents, e.g., the father (De Wit & Van Winden, 1989). Russel et al. (2003) suggest that fathers play a much greater role with respect to children's selection of a profession than do mothers. Dunn & Holtz-Eakin (2000) demonstrate that the sons of entrepreneurial fathers much more often become entrepreneurs themselves than do sons of entrepreneurial mothers. Hoffman et al. (2015) reveal that the effect of a self-employed father is higher for males and that of a self-employed mother is considerably higher for females. Nevertheless, Chlosta et al. (2012) show that both the maternal and paternal role models exert a direct and significant influence on children's decisions regarding self-employment.

Numerous studies that concentrate on parents' entrepreneurship have shown proven that many entrepreneurs are "family products" (Athayde, 2009; Carroll & Mosakowski, 1987; Niittykangas & Tervo,

2005; Sorenson, 2007; Taylor, 2001). Furthermore, genetic studies on entrepreneurial success have shown a large genetic component in the choice to become an entrepreneur (Nicolaou et al., 2008; Nicolaou & Shane, 2009, 2010, 2011; Zhang et al., 2009). Research conducted in Sweden on adopted children also offers interesting results; as far as their entrepreneurship is concerned, the influence of both biological and adoptive parents is significant, and the impact of postbirth factors (e.g., those produced by the adoptive parents) is approximately twice as strong as the impact of prebirth factors (e.g., those produced by the biological parents) (Lindquist, Sol & Van Praag, 2015). Thus, family may influence the choice of a career path (such as self-employment) or offer significant support (such as knowledge or funds) in setting up and running one's own business.

Based on the aforementioned research results, which have demonstrated the impact of having a successful entrepreneur in the family on undertaking business activities, we presumed the following: H1. People who have a successful entrepreneur in the family achieve greater entrepreneurial success in comparison to people who do not. Less data are available in the literature about the second and third paths (parental attitudes and communication). The notion of attitude itself is understood in multiple ways in the literature on psychology (Altmann, 2008; Chaiklin, 2011), which is indirectly related to attempts to highlight its various components. The definition of attitude ranges widely from “a disposition towards or against a specified phenomenon, person or thing” (Dawson, 1992, p. 473) to “evaluative judgments formed when needed, rather than enduring personal dispositions” (Schwarz, 2007, p. 639) to a “psychological tendency, expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor” (Eagly & Chaiken, 2007). An attitude reveals a positive or negative approach to a person or a thing and is therefore reflected in the beliefs, emotions, and behaviors of an individual.

A parental attitude expresses a specific stance of a parent towards a child: “[...] a holistic manner of the parents’ – both the father’s and the mother’s separately – approach to children’s upbringing, etc., which has shaped throughout serving the role of the parent” (Rembowski, 1972) or “[...] a fixed and acquired cognitive-aspirational-affective structure canalizing parents’ behaviour with respect to the child” (Ziemska, 1973). The significance of a bond between the parents and a child has a long tradition in psychological research and it is well-established in Bowlby (1969/1982, 1973, 1980). Research clearly shows that the relationship between the parent and the child plays a key role in the psychosocial development of the child (Plopa, 2015). Based on Bowlby’s work, Ainsworth (1977) distinguishes three attachment styles: secure (characterized by a child’s trust placed in the object of attachment, a sense of its accessibility, and parental sensitivity to the child’s needs), anxious-ambivalent (characterized by insecurity regarding to the accessibility of the object, a lowered sense of security, and a fear of separation), and avoidant (characterized by a sense of inaccessibility of the object, especially in threatening situations). The three attachment styles enumerated above are closely connected with parental attitudes, and their scope generally revolves around the following 5 parental attitudes:

- acceptance/rejection - understood as an attitude of giving the child a sense of support, security, and closeness. The other extreme of the acceptance attitude is the rejection attitude, in which the parent is seen as rejecting the child, being cold, and showing no appreciation for the child’s needs),
- excessive demands - such an attitude is presented by a parent who has unrealistic expectations towards a child, projects his or her high standards on the child, criticizes the child and imposes his or her will on the child;
- autonomy - this is the attitude presented by a parent supporting the child’s independence and need for privacy;
- inconsistency - a parent is perceived as volatile, and a child may never know what to expect from such a parent; and

- overprotection- a parent does everything for the child, e.g., helps the child in every situation out of fear that they will not be able to do things themselves and protects the child from any possibility of making a mistake.

Some of the enumerated attitudes (i.e., acceptance and autonomy) seem to fall into the pattern of the style described by Ainsworth as secure, whereas the remaining attitudes (excessive demands, overprotection, and inconsistency) may potentially pose a threat to the development of an individual as a result of, e.g., unrealistically high standards for an individual (due to excessive demands), a sense of a lack of stability in relations with other people (due to inconsistency) or convictions of one’s own incompetence in single-handedly dealing with the challenges of the environment (due to overprotection). Since psychology takes quite an unequivocal stance that clearly shows that the emotional bond with the parents influences a person’s development, including their personality (Maćik, 2018) and self-esteem, it seems that this influence may also be extended to business-related achievements. A family environment that is characterized by support, openness to exploration, readiness to share opinions and constructive remarks, and active listening seems to support traits that may prove to be useful in effective entrepreneurship in the future. Unfortunately, to date, there have been few studies that have attempted to analyze the relationship between parental attitudes/attachment and entrepreneurial success. A small number of publications have rather focused on examining the importance of family factors for business intentions or entrepreneurial attitudes. For instance, Kumar and Prabhu (2017) demonstrate that parents can significantly influence self-employment, with fathers having a stronger influence on sons and mothers on daughters. Additionally, Chlosta et al. (2012), by conducting a study on a group of 461 graduates, find that parents have a significant influence on the decision to become self-employed. Interestingly, this impact is not direct in relation to fathers but is mediated by the “openness” personality trait. According to the authors, “openness” is what determines whether a person will continue the entrepreneurial tradition in the family. Masruki et al. (2013) notes the importance of autonomy and freedom for business intentions, and Kirkwood (2007) notes that entrepreneurial men need their parents (especially their fathers) to respect their desire to be autonomous.

Due to the lack of similar research regarding entrepreneurial success, we based our hypotheses on information derived from research on entrepreneurial intentions and attitudes. On this basis we assumed the following:

H2. Entrepreneurial success depends on the parental attitudes of mothers and fathers; thus, attitudes of acceptance and autonomy have a positive relationship with the success achieved, while attitudes of excessive expectations, overprotection and inconsistency have a negative relationship with entrepreneurial success. Communication is also a factor in the family’s influence on the individual. In addition to the basic function of conveying information, communication also plays an important role in the internalization of values, rules and beliefs. The messages received within the family can relate directly to entrepreneurial activities. These are all kinds of messages in which one assesses one’s own business efforts, messages in which one responds to the issue of self-employment, messages in which one is encouraged to run a business or to continue the family business traditions. Simultaneously, there may occur communication within the family that lacks a “business message,” which refers to the way the child is accepted, valued, noticed, and so on, by the parent. Interestingly, with regard to entrepreneurial success, the role of family communication has not been studied yet. In a negligible number of publications, this issue has only been highlighted in passing. For example, Antawati (2019) argues that communication between a parent and a child, where the former understands the needs of the latter and engages in joint activities with the child, can help instill values (including entrepreneurial ones) in the child. Schröder, Schmitt-Rodermund, Arnaud, (2011) emphasize that for the continuation of

family business traditions, it is important to convey messages regarding the family business, whether they are positive or negative. Kirkwood (2007) stresses that female entrepreneurs need support and advice from their parents. Interestingly, there are no studies that examine the role of indirect family communication, which is not strictly related to business activities. On this basis we decided to investigate whether an open, satisfactory communication in the family of origin can possibly be in any relation to the achieved entrepreneurial success. Therefore, we assumed the following:

H3. Satisfactory communication in the family of origin has a positive relationship with entrepreneurial success.

Apart from parental attitudes and communication, general satisfaction with one’s family system also appears to be important from the perspective of entrepreneurial success. It seems that subjective satisfaction with one’s family may even be more significant than the more objective variables by which the structure of a family system is characterized (such as boundaries between family members, the quality and quantity of changes in the system, and coalitions).

H4. Satisfaction with the family system is positively correlated with the achievement of entrepreneurial success.

To recapitulate, the objective of the study is to verify the manner of exerting family influence (i.e., parental attitudes, communication) that significantly influences the achievement of entrepreneurial success.

3. Methodology

3.1. Study procedure

Data collection was carried out by a qualified psychologist and lasted from April 2017 to March 2018. The study was divided into two phases. First, using the Centralna Ewidencja i Informacja o Działalności Gospodarczej [Central Business Register and Information Service] (CEIDG), an initial database of 387 entrepreneurs was established. Then, the entrepreneurs were contacted over the phone and offered a part in the study. Out of the 387 entrepreneurs, 86 of them agreed to participate. Each of the respondents was informed about the purpose and procedure of the survey. Afterwards, they received an envelope with a set of questionnaires. The completed questionnaires were placed back in the envelope, and the respondents handed them over to the researcher.

Statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS 24 software for Windows. They were preceded by the verification of the normality of the distribution of the results for the individual questionnaires. The Shapiro-Wilk test was conducted to test the normality of the distribution ($N < 100$). Because the Shapiro-Wilk test was statistically significant for the scores on the subscales of acceptance (version for mothers and fathers), autonomy (version for mothers and fathers), demands (version for fathers), balanced flexibility, chaos, communication, and satisfaction, the correlations between parental attitudes and entrepreneurial success were verified through the use of the Spearman’s rho correlation coefficient. The significance of the differences in the average results achieved for entrepreneurial success was evaluated with the Mann-Whitney U test. Furthermore, in order to specify the predictive value of individual variables, stepwise regression was conducted. **The statistical significance threshold was set at $p < 0.05$.**

3.2. Description of the group

The study was conducted among 86 people; however, 22 questionnaire sets were excluded from further analysis. The reason for the exclusion was the incompleteness of data provided in a questionnaire. Ultimately, the research sample comprised 64 people. The researchers intended to examine individuals who had been effectively running their own business. The indicators of such effectiveness were the longevity of the business and the number of employees. The respondents in the study have run their business for 9.89 years on average ($SD = 7.24$, minimum = 2, maximum = 30), and the majority of the respondents have run their

business for 5 years. The companies employed 11.14 employees on average, and the majority had one employee (18.8%).

The research sample was composed of 25 women and 39 men aged 23–67 years ($M = 40.03$; $SD = 9.52$). At the moment of setting up their business, the entrepreneurs were 18 to 52 years old ($M = 30.20$; $SD = 7.49$). The companies were run in the following voivodeships: Mazowieckie (89.1%), Kujawsko-Pomorskie (4.7%), Warmińsko-Mazurskie (1.6%), Dolnośląskie (1.6%), Lubelskie (1.6%), and Łódzkie (1.6%). Before starting their business, the majority of the respondents did not have management experience (65.6%) and had no effective entrepreneurs in the family (43.8%) but did participated in trainings (courses, educational programs, workshops, postgraduate courses at universities) (54.7%); and had contact with clients (84.8%) (Table 1). These clients were mostly companies whose turnover had increased in comparison to the previous year (78.1%) and that evaluated the level of the companies’ average competitiveness and innovativeness (48.4% and 68.8%, respectively).

3.3. Methods

3.3.1. Questionnaire of entrepreneurial success (QES) (experimental version)

This tool was created by the authors, for the purpose of the current study. This is a 38-item self-report tool that measures entrepreneurial success in individuals who have owned a business for more than one year; this tool is to be used in scientific research, especially in group studies. The questionnaire is composed of two parts; the first part measures success in the first year of company functioning, and the second part measures success during the rest of the period, excluding the first year. The result is separately calculated for each part/perspective through the summing of the points obtained for relevant items (in

Table 1
Sociodemographic and business data ($N = 64$).

		N	%
Gender	Female	25	39.1
	Male	39	60.9
Experience in management	Yes	21	32.8
	No	42	65.6
Training	Yes	35	54.7
	No	28	43.8
Contact with the client	Yes	54	84.4
	No	8	12.5
Effective entrepreneur	Yes	28	43.8
	No	34	53.1
Voivodeship where the registered office is located	Mazowieckie	57	89.06
	Kujawsko-Pomorskie	3	4.7
	Warmińsko-Mazurskie	1	1.6
	Dolnośląskie	1	1.6
	Lubelskie	1	1.6
	Łódzkie	1	1.6
Turnover last year	Increase	50	78.1
	Decrease	14	21.9
Financial liquidity	Yes	59	92.2
	No	4	6.3
Competitiveness	High	25	39.1
	Average	31	48.4
	Low	7	10.9
Possibility of development	High	22	34.4
	Average	35	54.7
	Low	7	10.9
Innovativeness	High	11	17.2
	Average	44	68.8
	Low	9	14.1
Business range	Local	40	62.5
	Regional	13	20.3
	Countrywide	7	10.9
	International	4	6.3

accordance with the key). The total number of points in both parts serves as a general indicator of entrepreneurial success (representing the period between business commencement and the day of measurement). The score ranges between 38 and 114 points. The higher the score obtained on the test is, the higher the level of entrepreneurial success. The respondent is asked to express their response to each test statement (e.g., *I was employing increasingly more workers; I was satisfied with the profit that my business was generating; I believe that I was capable of achieving my goals (related to business development) established at the time of setting up the business*) by selecting any of the four available options: definitely agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, definitely disagree.

3.3.2. Questionnaire of the retrospective assessment of parental attitudes (QRAPA)

This is a 100-item tool (with 50 items for each parent) developed by Mieczysław Płopa used in the retrospective evaluation of the attitudes of mothers and fathers. The task of the participants in the study is to express their opinion regarding each statement by choosing one of five possible responses, ranging from “*He/she was definitely like that and behaved that way*” and “*He/she was definitely not like that and did not behave that way*”. The questionnaire is composed of 5 subscales (including 10 questions each):

- (1) Acceptance/rejection dimension: This dimension is manifested by a favorable atmosphere in which parents encourage the exchange of feelings, nurture their child’s trust towards people and the world, and display open, spontaneous, and accepting behaviors towards their child. The parent is perceived as caring, supportive, and responsive to the child’s needs. The following are some examples of items in this subscale: *My mother/father let me know he/she loved me; it was comforting for me to talk to him/her about my problems.*
- (2) Demanding dimension: The parent is considered to demand unconditional obedience and limit the child through bans and orders, punishments, criticism, and a punitive attitude. The following are some examples of items in this subscale: *He/she believed that I had no right to object to him/her; if something were wrong, he/she would try to blame me.*
- (3) Autonomy dimension: The parent is seen as supportive of his or her child’s independence in terms of decision making and problem solving and is thus tolerant, flexible, and able to appreciate the child’s developing need for privacy. The following are some examples of items in this subscale: *He/she respected my views and interests; he/she did not require me to agree with him/her about everything.*
- (4) Inconsistency dimension: The parent is perceived as an unstable, moody, nervous, inconsistent person with respect to the expression of one’s opinions, feelings, and decision making. The following are some examples of items on this subscale: *Sometimes I did not understand why I would be punished less severely for something at one time and then more severely punished for the same thing on another occasion; if he/she had a bad day, he/she would yell at me for no reason.*
- (5) Protection dimension: The parent excessively interferes with the child’s life or his or her problems and issues and wants to know and see everything. The following are some examples of items in this subscale: *He/she always wanted to know where I was and what I was doing; he/she worried that I might not be able to cope with many things in life.*

The results for the individual dimensions range from 10 to 50.

3.3.3. Family Assessment Scales (FAS)

This is a Polish adaptation of H. Olson’s FACES-IV D by A. Margasiński. The questionnaire is intended to assess the functioning of a family. The respondent’s task is to provide answers to 62 questions on a

5-degree scale (from “completely disagree” to “completely agree” for questions 1–52 and from “very dissatisfied” to “very satisfied” for questions 53–62). The questionnaire is composed of 8 scales; six of them are the main scales of the Circumplex Model created by David H. Olson, which are concerned with two dimensions of the functioning of a family, namely, cohesion and flexibility (i.e., balanced cohesion, disengagement, enmeshment, balanced flexibility, rigidity, and chaos). The two remaining scales measure communication (which is the third dimension of the Circumplex Model) and satisfaction with family life. Apart from the scores on the individual scales, the tool measures three complex indicators: cohesion, flexibility, and the total score, which is the measure of the appropriate functioning of a family. The following are some examples of items in this questionnaire: *Family members are able to calmly discuss problems; family members try to understand each other’s feelings; in our family, it is important to follow rules.*

3.3.4. Personal details datasheet

This tool was created by the authors, for the purpose of the current study. This is a tool that serves to gather fundamental sociodemographic information about the entrepreneur under examination (such as age, age at the moment of starting a business, and sex) and information about the business (such as the year of commencement, the voivodeship where the company’s registered office is located, number of employees, and scope of activity).

4. Results

First, the modeling processes were examined to determine whether they might have an impact on entrepreneurial success. To this end, researchers checked whether having a successful entrepreneur in the family is in any way related to entrepreneurial success. To this end, the research sample was divided into two groups. The first group comprised individuals who had a successful entrepreneur in the family, and the second group comprised those who had no such entrepreneur in the family. The findings show that having a successful entrepreneur in the family is important for the achievement of long-term entrepreneurial success. However, it is less important for the achievement of success in the first year of running a business. Entrepreneurs who have a successful entrepreneur in the family scored higher in the long-term perspective, on average, compared to entrepreneurs who do not have a successful entrepreneur in the family (see Table 2).

Second, (see Table 3), the correlations between mothers’ and fathers’ parental attitudes and entrepreneurial success were verified. These correlations were examined after adjustments were made for three indicators of entrepreneurial success: an entrepreneur being successful in the first year of running the business, success archived in the subsequent years (excluding the first year of running the business), and the general

Table 2
Differences in entrepreneurial success achieved by those who have a successful entrepreneur in the family and those who do not have a successful entrepreneur in the family.

	Successful entrepreneur in the family		No successful entrepreneur in the family		Z	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Entrepreneurial success (total score)	81.76	15.92	73.10	16.76	-2.21	0.027*
Entrepreneurial success (the first year)	36.79	9.10	35.84	8.24	-0.38	0.703
Entrepreneurial success (since the commencement of business, excluding the first year)	44.36	10.48	37.74	10.91	-0.15	0.032*

* The statistical significance threshold was set at p < 0.05.

Table 3
Spearman’s rho correlations between the scores on the QES and the scores on the Questionnaire of the Retrospective Assessment of Parental Attitudes.

	Mother		Father		
	Acceptance	Excessive demands	Autonomy	Inconsistency	Excessive protection
Entrepreneurial success (total score)	0.06	-0.35*	0.09	-0.48*	-0.25
Entrepreneurial success (the first year)	0.09	-0.32*	0.01	-0.25	-0.07
Entrepreneurial success (since the commencement of business, excluding the first year)	0.07	-0.28*	0.05	-0.46*	-0.34*
	Acceptance	Excessive demands	Autonomy	Inconsistency	Excessive protection
Entrepreneurial success (total score)	0.15	-0.35*	0.18	-0.44*	-0.24
Entrepreneurial success (the first year)	0.16	-0.19	0.01	-0.16	-0.21
Entrepreneurial success (since the commencement of business, excluding the first year)	0.26	-0.32*	0.22	-0.45*	-0.22

* The statistical significance threshold was set at $p < 0.05$.

indicator of entrepreneurial success (summarized success in the first year and the subsequent years). Success in the first year (i.e., in the short-term perspective) was negatively correlated only with mothers’ attitudes of making excessive demands; however, it was not correlated with fathers’ corresponding parental attitudes. Success achieved since the commencement of the business but excluding the first year (i.e., in the long-term perspective) was negatively correlated with mothers’ and fathers’ attitudes of making excessive demands as well as with mothers’ and fathers’ inconsistency and mothers’ overprotection. Entrepreneurial success, summarized as short-term and long-term success, was negatively correlated with mothers’ and fathers’ excessive demands and inconsistency. However, no correlations emerged between entrepreneurial success and the attitudes of acceptance and autonomy displayed by either mothers or fathers.

The predictive value of independent variables was verified for entrepreneurial success from the long-term perspective, i.e., success since the commencement of the business, excluding the first year of operation, and for the success measured as the general indicator on the QES (summarized success in the short- and the long-term perspective). Communication, satisfaction with one’s family, and parental attitudes that were significantly correlated with entrepreneurial success (that is, mothers’ and fathers’ excessive demands, mother’s overprotection, and mothers’ and fathers’ inconsistency) were introduced as independent variables into each of the two models. Mothers’ and fathers’ inconsistency predicted long-term success, whereas mothers’ inconsistency predicted summarized success in the first year and subsequent years (see Table 4).

Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that communication within the family and general satisfaction with one’s family are significant for long-term success (i.e., success since the commencement of the business, excluding the first year of operation). The higher the satisfaction with one’s family is and the more positive the perception of communication among family members is, the higher the level of entrepreneurial success is. Interestingly, similar correlation was not found with entrepreneurial success achieved in the first year of running a business (see Table 5).

Table 4
Family predictors of entrepreneurial success.

Summary of regression of the dependent variable: <i>entrepreneurial success (total score)</i>										
Independent variable	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Variation R ²	B	Beta	F	P	t	P
Mother’s inconsistency	0.48	0.23	0.21	0.23	-0.69	-0.48	10.59	0.002	-3.25	0.002
Summary of regression of the dependent variable: <i>entrepreneurial success (since the commencement of business, excluding the first year)</i>										
Mother’s inconsistency	0.59	0.35	0.32	0.08	-0.39	-0.37	10.26	0.000	-2.45	0.020
Father’s inconsistency					-0.34	-0.32			-2.13	0.040

*The statistical significance threshold was set at $p < 0.05$.

Table 5
Spearman’s rho correlations between the scores on the QES and the scores on the FAS.

	Entrepreneurial success (total score)	Entrepreneurial success (the first year)	Entrepreneurial success (since the commencement of business, excluding the first year)
Balanced cohesion	0.19	0.21	0.13
Balanced flexibility	0.08	0.00	0.06
Disengagement	-0.19	-0.12	-0.22
Enmeshment	-0.06	-0.07	-0.11
Rigidity	-0.00	-0.11	0.01
Chaos	-0.20	0.07	-0.25
Communication	0.34*	0.24	0.32*
Satisfaction	0.31*	0.27	0.29*
Rigidity	-0.00	-0.11	0.01
Chaos	-0.20	0.07	-0.25
Communication	0.34*	0.24	0.32*
Satisfaction	0.31*	0.27	0.29*

* The statistical significance threshold was set at $p < 0.05$.

5. Discussion

In addition to work, family is one of the most significant areas of people’s activity (Lachowska, 2012). Family may contribute to one’s growth or, on the contrary, suppress it. The family shapes one’s values, self-esteem, personality, body image, and beliefs (Biernat, 2016; Nakao et al., 2000; Plopa, 2015). The family produces a specific three-way impact on a person through the attitudes, communication, and modeling presented.

The modeling that is relevant for entrepreneurial success is the element that has been the most extensively discussed in the literature, while the two other methods of exerting influence have been less researched (Andersson & Hammarstedt, 2010, 2011; Arum & Müller, 2009; Bandura, 1986; Colombier & Masclet, 2008; Dunn & Holtz-Eakin,

2000; Krumboltz et al., 1976; Lindquist, Sol, & Van Praag, 2015; Sorensen, 2007). Generally, research has demonstrated that having a successful entrepreneur in the family or a parent who runs his or her own business positively contributes to future business activity. Obviously, this influence may be reversed; a parent's failure in business may suppress his or her children's business activity in the future (Galambos & Silbereisen, 1987; Mungai & Velamuri, 2011). The present study analyses this method of exerting influence by means of comparing two groups of entrepreneurs (who have a successful entrepreneur in the family versus those who do not) in terms of the achievement of entrepreneurial success. Entrepreneurial success was measured from three perspectives: the short-term perspective (covering the first year of running a business), the long-term perspective (including the commencement of the business but excluding the first year), and the summarized short- and long-term perspectives. The findings have demonstrated that the significance of a successful entrepreneur in the family only reveals itself in the later years of running a business. In the first year, the presence of a successful entrepreneur does not differentiate between the two groups. Such findings impel reflection on the significance of the psychological factors in the first and the subsequent years of running a business. Perhaps nonpsychological factors, such as the possession of capital, premises, a business plan (Agarwal & Dahm, 2015) or enthusiasm, are more important in the first year of operation. In addition, only in subsequent years is effectiveness in terms of business development strictly dependent on psychological factors such as the observation of the activity of a successful entrepreneur in the family, personality traits, and self-esteem. Analysis of the correlations between parental attitudes and entrepreneurial success seems to confirm these initial conclusions. Essentially, entrepreneurial success in the first year of running a business was not significantly correlated with the majority of parental attitudes (with the only exception being mothers' attitudes of making excessive demands), family structure, communication in the family or satisfaction with one's family. It seems as if during the first year of running a business, family is not of major significance for the achievement of success, whereas organizational, institutional, and economic factors appear to be more important (Bahari, Jabar, & Yunus, 2017). In the subsequent years of running a business, the situation changes to favor the importance of psychological factors. At that time, the psychological factors largely shaped by the family system are most likely to manifest their importance in the achievement of entrepreneurial success. These conclusions are confirmed in studies demonstrating correlations between psychological factors and entrepreneurial success (Chen, Greene & Crick, 1998; Collins, Hanges & Locke, 2004; Engle, Mah & Sadri, 1997; Furnham & Fudge 2008; Klein et al. 2004; McClelland, 1961; Rauch & Frese 2007; Schmitt-Rodermund & Vondracek, 2002; Stewart & Roth 2001; Zhang & Arvey 2009; Zhao, Seibert & Hills 2005).

In our study, long-term entrepreneurial success was positively correlated with communication and satisfaction with one's family. This finding may be explained by the fact that open communication (in which family members express their views and opinions without "attacking" or judging one another and in which there is no destructive criticism) that is simultaneously accompanied by satisfaction with one's family may contribute to the development of the psychological traits that will serve as resources for effective business operation in the future. Such conclusions are confirmed in further analyses examining the correlations between parental attitudes and entrepreneurial success. Entrepreneurial success was negatively correlated with the parental attitudes (of both mothers and fathers), that is, excessive demands, overprotection, and inconsistency. It may thus be assumed that endowing individuals with unrealistically high standards (through making excessive demands), shaping their sense of a lack of stability in relations with other people (through inconsistency) or convincing them of their inability to single-handedly cope with the challenges of their environment (through overprotection) may lead to the establishment of psychological "barriers" (such as "pathological" perfectionism or the anxious-dependent

personality). These consequences, in turn, may hinder the entrepreneurial "expansion" of a potential entrepreneur. An interesting finding, on the other hand, is the lack of a correlation between entrepreneurial success and the attitudes of acceptance and autonomy. Perhaps a child's mere evaluation of a parent's company as pleasant and safe, along with the parent's simultaneous tendency to respect the child's privacy, is important for the child's development. In contrast, these qualities are not significant in shaping the traits that may prove to be useful in the achievement of entrepreneurial success. These conclusions also appear to be confirmed in regression analyses that examined the predictive value of individual family variables to entrepreneurial success. Such predictive value (to long-term entrepreneurial success) was achieved by mothers' and fathers' attitudes of inconsistency.

6. Conclusions

The results of the present study confirm that entrepreneurial success may be conditioned by the family of origin. Such an influence may be exerted through modeling processes and communication as well as through the attitudes displayed by the parents. Undoubtedly, one of the merits of the study is the analysis of entrepreneurial success from various time perspectives. After all, entrepreneurial success may vary over time. Failure may follow initial successes or vice versa. One may also be successful from the onset of the business throughout its operation. Initial conclusions from the study appear to suggest that perhaps the contribution and significance of individual (organizational, institutional versus psychological) factors change depending on the stage of running the business. It might be the case that the contribution of the psychological factors conditioned by family factors is significant only in the later stages of running a business. Perhaps starting a company is dependent on factors such as capital and infrastructure to a larger extent, whereas its development is contingent upon the entrepreneur's traits that are (both directly and indirectly) considerably influenced by the family. Such an approach sheds new light on business success and family conditioning. Gaining a more thorough understanding of the notion of long-term entrepreneurial success, along with a precise identification of its determinants, will make it possible to better predict the achievement of entrepreneurial success by a potential entrepreneur in the future, which will certainly translate into an array of institutional and economic benefits.

7. Limitations and future research

Finally, it is worth mentioning the limitations of the study. First, the study was conducted on a relatively small group of people. Thus, it would be wise to run an analogous or similar study on a larger population. The study was largely limited to the group of small enterprises. A similar study could also be conducted on a group of macro-entrepreneurs. Finally, the design of the study is mainly correlational, which precludes the ability to draw cause-and-effect conclusions. Furthermore, the study examines communication understood as general satisfaction with the manner of communication among family members. It would also be worthwhile to analyze the influence of communication understood in a narrower sense, for example, as messages encouraging or, on the contrary, discouraging one to run his or her own business.

8. Practical implications

It seems that an in-depth exploration of the influence of the family of origin on future entrepreneurial success could make a significant contribution to increasing entrepreneurial efficiency. Reinforcing (through properly designed workshops or trainings) an appropriate path of parental influence (modeling, parental attitudes, communication) could strengthen those traits that are significant for business effectiveness.

References

- Abu, F., Yunus, A. R., Majid, I. A., Jabar, J., Aris, A., Sakidin, H., & Ahmad, A. (2014). Technology acceptance model (TAM): Empowering smart customer to participate in electricity supply system. *Journal of Technology Management and Technopreneurship*, 2(1), 85–94.
- Agarwal, R., & Dahm, M. J. (2015). Success factors in independent ethnic restaurants. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 18(1), 20–33.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1977). Infant development and mother-infant interaction among Ganda and American families. *Culture and infancy*, 119–150.
- Alroaia, Y. V., & Baharun, R. B. (2018). Identification and prioritizing influential factors on entrepreneurial success: A case study of SMEs in Iran and Malaysia. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 17(2), 31–40.
- Altmann, T. (2008). Attitude: A Concept Analysis. *Nursing Forum*, 43(3), 144–150.
- Andersson, L., & Hammarstedt, M. (2010). Intergenerational transmissions in immigrant self-employment: Evidence from three generations. *Small Business Economics*, 34(3), 261–276.
- Andersson, L., & Hammarstedt, M. (2011). Transmission of self-employment across immigrant generations: The importance of ethnic background and gender. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 9(4), 555–577.
- Angel, P., Jenkins, A., & Stephens, A. (2018). Understanding entrepreneurial success: A phenomenographic approach. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(6), 611–636. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242618768662>.
- Antawati, D. I. (2019). Parent role in promoting children's entrepreneurship intention. Retrieved from (15.07.2019): https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dewi_Antawati2/publication/313055840_PARENT_ROLE_IN_PROMOTING_CHILDRENS_ENTREPRENEURSHIP_INTENTION/links/588ef8c0a6fdcc8e63cbb770/PARENT-ROLE-IN-PROMOTING-CHILDRENS-ENTREPRENEURSHIP-INTENTION.pdf.
- Arum, R., & Müller, W. (Eds.). (2009). *The reemergence of self-employment: A comparative study of self-employment dynamics and social inequality*. NY: Princeton University Press.
- Athayde, R. (2009). Measuring enterprise potential in young people. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(2), 481–500.
- Bahari, N., Jabar, J., & Yunus, A. R. (2017). Malaysian women entrepreneurial characteristics, strategic orientation and firm performance: The moderator role of government support programs. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 4(12), 257–262.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, US: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Baron, R. A., & Markman, G. D. (2003). Beyond social capital: The role of entrepreneurs' social competence in their financial success. *Journal of business venturing*, 18(1), 41–60.
- Baron, R. A., & Tang, J. (2009). Entrepreneurs' social skills and new venture performance: Mediating mechanisms and cultural generality. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 282–306.
- Berge, L. I. O., & Pires, A. J. G. (2019). Gender, formality, and entrepreneurial success. *Small Business Economics*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00163-8>.
- Biernat, R. (2016). Troska o poczucie własnej wartości dzieci w rzeczywistości szkolnej – wymiar teoretyczny i praktyczne implikacje [Care about Children's Self-Esteem in School Reality – Theoretical Dimension and Practical Implications]. *Spoleczeństwo. Edukacja. Język*, 4, 150–167.
- Bosma, N., Hessels, J., Schutjens, V., Van Praag, M., & Verheul, I. (2012). Entrepreneurship and role models. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 33(2), 410–424.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd. ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss. Separation, anxiety and anger* (Vol. 2).
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss. Loss, sadness and depression* (Vol. 3).
- Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. (1987). Work and family (273–320). In C. L. Cooper, & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- Carroll, G. R., & Mosakowski, E. (1987). The career dynamics of self-employment. *Administrative science quarterly*, 570–589.
- Chaiklin, H. (2011). Attitudes, Behavior, and Social Practice. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 38(1), 31–54.
- Chen, C. C., Greene, P. G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(4), 295–316.
- Chlosta, S., Patzelt, H., Klein, S. B., & Dormann, C. (2012). Parental role models and the decision to become self-employed: The moderating effect of personality. *Small Business Economics*, 38(1), 121–138.
- Collins, C. J., Hanges, P. J., & Locke, E. A. (2004). The relationship of achievement motivation to entrepreneurial behavior: A meta-analysis. *Human Performance*, 17(1), 95–117.
- Colombier, N., & Masclat, D. (2008). Intergenerational correlation in self-employment: Some further evidence from French ECHP data. *Small Business Economics*, 30(4), 423–437.
- Constantinidis, C., Lebègue, T., El Abboubi, M., & Salman, N. (2019). How families shape women's entrepreneurial success in Morocco: An intersectional study. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25(8), 1786–1808. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-12-2017-0501>.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *Coopersmith self-esteem inventory form A*. Self-Esteem Institute.
- Crespo, C., Kiełpikowski, M., Jose, P., & Pryor, J. (2010). Relationships between family connectedness and body satisfaction: A longitudinal study of adolescent girls and boys. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 39, 1392–1401.
- Curtis, C., & Loomans, C. (2014). Friends, family, and their influence on body image dissatisfaction. *Women's Studies Journal*, 28(2), 39–56.
- Davidsson, P., & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of business venturing*, 18(3), 301–331.
- Dawson, K. P. (1992). Attitude and assessment in nursing education. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 17, 473–479.
- De Wit, G., & Van Winden, F. A. (1989). An empirical analysis of self-employment in the Netherlands. *Small Business Economics*, 1(4), 263–272.
- Dunn, T., & Holtz-Eakin, D. (2000). Financial capital, human capital, and the transition to self-employment: Evidence from intergenerational links. *Journal of labor economics*, 18(2), 282–305.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (2007). The advantages of an inclusive definition of attitude. *Social cognition*, 25(5), 582–602.
- Engle, D. E., Mah, J. J., & Sadri, G. (1997). An empirical comparison of entrepreneurs and employees: Implications for innovation. *Creativity Research Journal*, 10(1), 45–49. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1001_5.
- Francisco, R., Narciso, I., & Alarcao, M. (2013). Parental influences on elite aesthetic athletes' body image dissatisfaction and disordered eating. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 22(8), 1082–1091.
- Furnham, A., & Fudge, C. (2008). The five factor model of personality and sales performance. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 29(1), 11–16. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001.29.1.11>.
- Galambos, N. L., & Silbereisen, R. K. (1987). Income change, parental life outlook, and adolescent expectations for job success. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 141–149.
- González Sánchez, V. M. (2018). Self-employment, Knowledge and Economic Growth: An empirical study for Latin American countries. *Contemporary Economics*, 12(4), 473–484.
- Green, S., & Pryde, P. (1989). *Black entrepreneurship in America*. Piscataway, USA: Transaction Publishers.
- Hoffmann, A., Junge, M., & Malchow-Møller, N. (2015). Running in the family: Parental role models in entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 44(1), 79–104.
- Hundley, G. (2006). Family Background and the Propensity for Self-Employment. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 45(3), 377–392.
- Joona, P. A. (2018). How does motherhood affect self-employment performance? *Small Business Economics*, 50(1), 29–54.
- Kalleberg, A. L., & Leicht, K. T. (1991). Gender and organizational performance: Determinants of small business survival and success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(1), 136–161.
- Kirkwood, J. (2007). Igniting the entrepreneurial spirit: Is the role parents play gendered? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 13(1), 39–59.
- Klein, K. J., Lim, B. C., Saltz, J. L., & Mayer, D. M. (2004). How do they get there? An examination of the antecedents of centrality in team networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(6), 952–963.
- Krumboltz, J. D., Mitchell, A. M., & Jones, G. B. (1976). A social learning theory of career selection. *The counseling psychologist*, 6(1), 71–81.
- Kumar, S. A., & Prabhu, J. J. (2017). Understanding Parental Factors and Entrepreneurial Attitude-The Moderating Effect of Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, 3(6), 1371–1374.
- Lachowska, B. (2012). *Praca i rodzina. Konflikt czy synergia? [Work and Family. Conflict or Synergy?]* Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Laspita, S., Breugt, N., Heblich, S., & Patzelt, H. (2012). Intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(4), 414–435.
- Lindquist, M. J., Sol, J., & Van Praag, M. (2015). Why do entrepreneurial parents have entrepreneurial children? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 33(2), 269–296.
- Makhbul, Z. M., & Hasun, F. M. (2010). Entrepreneurial success: An exploratory study among entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(1), 116.
- Masruki, R., Zakaria, N., Mohd Dali, N. R. S., Nordin, S. N., & Salikin, N. (2013). Determinants of Motivating Muslims to Become Entrepreneurs in Malaysia. *Ulum Islamiyyah: The Malaysian Journal of Islamic Sciences*, 8, 97–107.
- Maçik, D. (2018). Early maladaptive schemas, parental attitudes and temperament, and the evolution of borderline and avoidant personality features – the search for interdependencies. *Clinical Psychiatry*, 18(1), 12–18.
- McClelland, D. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Mungai, E., & Velamuri, S. R. (2011). Parental entrepreneurial role model influence on male offspring: Is it always positive and when does it occur? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(2), 337–357.
- Nakao, K., Takaishi, J., Tatsuta, K., Katayama, H., Iwase, M., Yorifuji, K., & Takeda, M. (2000). The influences of family environment on personality traits. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 54(1), 91–95.
- Nicolaou, N., & Shane, S. (2009). Can genetic factors influence the likelihood of engaging in entrepreneurial activity? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(1), 1–22.
- Nicolaou, N., & Shane, S. (2010). Entrepreneurship and occupational choice: Genetic and environmental influences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 76(1), 3–14.
- Nicolaou, N., & Shane, S. (2011). 29 The genetics of entrepreneurship. In D. B. Audretsch, O. Falck, S. Heblich, & A. Lederer (Eds.), *Handbook of research on innovation and entrepreneurship*, 471. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Nicolaou, N., Shane, S., Cherkas, L., Hunkin, J., & Spector, T. D. (2008). Is the tendency to engage in entrepreneurship genetic? *Management Science*, 54(1), 167–179.
- Niittykangas, H., & Tervo, H. (2005). Spatial variations in intergenerational transmission of self-employment. *Regional Studies*, 39(3), 319–332.
- Obschonka, M., Duckworth, K., Silbereisen, R. K., & Schoon, I. (2012). Social competencies in childhood and adolescence and entrepreneurship in young adulthood: A two-study analysis. *International journal of developmental science*, 6(3–4), 137–150.
- Oren, L., Caduri, A., & Tziner, A. (2013). Intergenerational occupational transmission: Do offspring walk in the footsteps of mom or dad, or both? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(3), 551–560.

- Overall, J., & Wise, S. (2016). The Antecedents of Entrepreneurial Success: A Mixed Methods Approach. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 24(03), 209–241.
- Pablo-Lerchundi, I., Morales-Alonso, G., & González-Tirados, R. M. (2015). Influences of parental occupation on occupational choices and professional values. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(7), 1645–1649.
- Pablo Lerchundi, I. D., Morales Alonso, G., & Vargas Pérez, A. M. (2014). Does family matter? A study of parents' influence on the entrepreneurial intention of technical degrees students in Spain. *Ice*.
- Plopa, M. (2015). Psychologia rodziny. Teoria i badania. [Family Psychology. Theory and Studies]. Kraków: Impuls.
- Rauch, A., & Frese, M. (2007). Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: A meta-analysis on the relationship between business owners' personality traits, business creation, and success. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16(4), 353–385.
- Razmus, W., & Laguna, M. (2018). Dimensions of entrepreneurial success: A multilevel study on stakeholders of micro-enterprises. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 791.
- Rembowski, J. (1972). Więzy uczuciowe w rodzinie [Emotional Bonds in a Family]. Warszawa: PWN.
- Russel, J., Jarvis, M., Roberts, C., Dwyer, D., & Putwain, D. (2003). *Angels on applied psychology*. Tewkesbury: Nelson Thornes.
- Ryś, M. (2011). Kształtowanie się poczucia własnej wartości i relacji z innymi w różnych systemach rodzinnych [The Shaping of Self-Esteem and Relationships with Others in Various Family Systems]. *Kwartalnik Naukowy*, 2(6), 64–83.
- Sassetti, S., Cavaliere, V., & Lombardi, S. (2019). Entrepreneurial success: a theoretical contribution linking affect and cognition. In *The Anatomy of Entrepreneurial Decisions* (pp. 57-77). Cham: Springer.
- Schmitt-Rodermund, E. (2004). Pathways to successful entrepreneurship: Parenting, personality, early entrepreneurial competence, and interests. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 65(3), 498–518.
- Schmitt-Rodermund, E., & Vondracek, F. W. (2002). Occupational dreams, choices and aspirations: Adolescents' entrepreneurial prospects and orientations. *Journal of Adolescence*, 25(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2001.0449>.
- Schröder, E., Schmitt-Rodermund, E., & Arnaud, N. (2011). Career choice intentions of adolescents with a family business background. *Family Business Review*, 24(4), 305–321.
- Schwarz, N. (2007). Attitude construction: Evaluation in context. *Social Cognition*, 25(5), 638–656.
- Scott, M. G., & Twomey, D. F. (1988). The long-term supply of entrepreneurs: Students' career aspirations in relation to entrepreneurship. *Journal of small business management*, 26(4), 5.
- Shakeel, M., Yaokuang, L., & Gohar, A. (2020). Identifying the Entrepreneurial Success Factors and the Performance of Women-Owned Businesses in Pakistan: The Moderating Role of National Culture. *SAGE Open*, 10(2), 2158244020919520.
- Staniewski, M., Awruk, K. (2018). Systems Approach to Entrepreneurial Success: The Theoretical Discussion on the Significance of Family Factors for Effective Entrepreneurship (in:) D. R. Soriano, A. Tur Porcar (ed.). *Inside the Mind of the Entrepreneur. Cognition, Personality Traits, Intention, and Gender Behavior*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- Staniewski, M. W., & Awruk, K. (2018). Questionnaire of entrepreneurial success—Report on the initial stage of method construction. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, 437–442.
- Stewart, W. H., Jr, & Roth, P. L. (2001). Risk propensity differences between entrepreneurs and managers: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 145. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.145>.
- Taylor, M. P. (2001). Self-employment and windfall gains in Britain: Evidence from panel data. *Economica*, 68(272), 539–565.
- Torres Marin, A.J. (2020). Learning Lessons from the Economic Crisis in Self-employment. *Contemporary Economics*, 14(1), 2020 3-21.
- Turner, S., & Lapan, R. T. (2002). Career self-efficacy and perceptions of parent support in adolescent career development. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 51(1), 44–55.
- Vincent, M. A., & McCabe, M. P. (2000). Gender differences among adolescents in family, and peer influences on body dissatisfaction, weight loss, and binge eating behaviors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29, 205–221.
- Wang, C. K., & Wong, P. K. (2004). Entrepreneurial interest of university students in Singapore. *Technovation*, 24(2), 163–172.
- Welsh, D. H., & Kaciak, E. (2019). Family enrichment and women entrepreneurial success: The mediating effect of family interference. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 15(4), 1045–1075.
- Whiston, S. C., & Keller, B. K. (2004). The influences of the family of origin on career development: A review and analysis. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 32(4), 493–568.
- Zhang, Z., & Arvey, R. D. (2009). Rule Breaking in Adolescence and Entrepreneurial Status: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, 436–447.
- Zhang, Z., Zyphur, M. J., Narayanan, J., Arvey, R. D., Chaturvedi, S., Avolio, B. J., ... Larsson, G. (2009). The genetic basis of entrepreneurship: Effects of gender and personality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110(2), 93–107.
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The Mediating Role of Self-Efficacy in the Development of Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1265–1272.
- Ziemska, M. (1973). *Postawy rodzicielskie [Parental Attitudes]*. Warszawa: WP.
- Marcin W. Staniewski, Ph.D. is an academic from the University of Economics and Human Sciences in Warsaw. He has been working as a scientists and academic teacher since 2000 and since 2019 as Vice Rector for Science. He has received several prestigious awards and he is the author of a number of publications. His main area of expertise is human resources management, innovativeness, knowledge management, entrepreneurship and e-business. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1913-6007>
- Katarzyna Awruk – Master's Degree in psychology, specializing in clinical psychology. For the last few years, she has been cooperating with the Psychology department of the University of Economics and Human Sciences in Warsaw. Her research mainly focuses on two subject areas: the importance of family in entrepreneurial success and family systems in formation of body image. She combines her scientific activity and research with psychological practice (participated in many trainings, practices cognitive behavioral therapy). She coauthored numerous scientific publications. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3068-6309>