ENTREPRENEURIAL MINDSET DEVELOPMENT IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA: FAMILY ROLE AND EARLY MARKET PARTICIPATION

Patricea Elena BERTEA[1], Mălina-Mihaela CHELARU[1] , Armand Florin BERTEA[1]

[1]*Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Iași, Romania*
patricea.bertea@gmail.com
malina.chelaru@uaic.ro
armandbertea@gmail.com

Abstract: *Many researchers have shown that the family is the most important factor in the development of the entrepreneurial mindset. Children who grow up with entrepreneurial parents are much more likely to become entrepreneurs themselves. However, most of this research was done in Western countries where private business was never interrupted. This paper looks at what happens when entrepreneurial family tradition was destroyed, as it was in Romania during about forty years of communist rule. During that period, private business was forbidden, parents could not pass on entrepreneurial values to their children. This study is based on thirteen semi-structured interviews with Romanian entrepreneurs who were born between 1988 and 2001, meaning they grew up after communism ended but their parents lived most of their lives under it. The data were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis. The study found two main ways in which entrepreneurial mindset developed without the support of an entrepreneurial family. The first way, which was the most common, is that participants did not want to live the same kind of life as their parents. Their parents were capable people who were prevented by the communist system from becoming entrepreneurs, and many of them ended up with regrets. Seeing this, the participants decided they would not repeat the same trajectory. The second way involves early experience with real money and real markets, such as selling products at agricultural markets, renting objects to neighbours, or earning money independently as teenagers. These experiences gave participants the practical understanding of business that family entrepreneurial tradition would normally provide. The findings show that the post-communist rupture of intergenerational transmission produced a generation that developed entrepreneurial dispositions through alternative pathways.*

Keywords: *entrepreneurial mindset; intergenerational transmission; post-communist entrepreneurship; negative identification; early market participation.*

JEL Classification: *L26; M13; P20*

1. Introduction

Research has shown that family plays a very important role in the development of the entrepreneurial mindset. When parents are entrepreneurs, their children are more likely to become entrepreneurs too. Parents pass on values, knowledge, and ways of thinking that help children see business as something possible and desirable (Lindquist et al., 2015; Laspita et al., 2012). However, almost all this research was done in Western countries where families were always free to be involved in private business. What happens when this normal family channel was broken for a long period of time?

Romania is a very relevant example of this situation. For about forty years under communist rule, private business was not allowed and people could not freely develop economic initiatives (Smallbone and Welter, 2001). The ways in which entrepreneurial knowledge and values are normally passed from parents to children through family businesses, role models, and everyday economic experience were all stopped. After communism ended in 1989 and Romania joined the European Union in 2007, entrepreneurship became possible again. But the entrepreneurial mindset, understood as a set of values and ways of thinking about business, was mostly missing from families where the parents had grown up under communism (Peng, 2003; Welter, 2011). So, the first generation that grew up completely after communism, those born in the late 1980s and 1990s, had to develop an entrepreneurial mindset without the family support that research normally describes.

Existing research has not really looked at this problem. Studies about how family influences entrepreneurship almost always assume that the influence works in a *positive* direction: entrepreneurial parents create entrepreneurial children (Lindquist et al., 2015; Laspita et al., 2012). This leaves two important mechanisms unexplained. First, what happens when parents were not entrepreneurs, not because they chose not to be, but because the political system did not allow it? In this case, children may develop entrepreneurial motivation in a different way: not by following their parents, but by deciding they do not want to repeat their parents frustrated, limited lives. Second, what other ways might people develop the practical economic knowledge that usually comes from family entrepreneurial experience? One important answer, found in this study, is early participation in real economic activities such as selling goods, managing money, or working independently at a young age.

This paper addresses this gap through a qualitative study of thirteen Romanian entrepreneurs from the first post-communist generation, born between 1988 and 2001. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and analysed using reflexive thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The study identifies two main patterns. In most cases, motivation to become an entrepreneur came not from having entrepreneurial parents, but from seeing the limited, employee-bound lives of parents who were prevented by communism from becoming entrepreneurs and deciding not to repeat that path. In a smaller number of cases, participants developed practical business knowledge through early real-money market activities selling goods, working independently, managing money as children or teenagers which gave them the economic understanding that family entrepreneurial tradition would normally provide.

The present research makes two contributions. First, it shows that the factors that lead to entrepreneurial mindset development are not the same everywhere; they depend on the historical and institutional context of the place where people grow up. Second, it provides a qualitative study of how entrepreneurial mindsets developed among the post-communist generation in Romania, a context that has received little attention in international entrepreneurship research.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. The Entrepreneurial Mindset

The entrepreneurial mindset is generally understood as a set of ways of thinking and acting that help people identify and pursue business opportunities, manage uncertainty, and keep trying even when things are difficult (Daspit et al., 2021). Davis et al. (2016) define it as *"the constellation of motives, skills, and thought processes that distinguish entrepreneurs from non-entrepreneurs"*. An important contribution to understanding the mindset comes from Carol Dweck's work. Dweck and Yeager (2019) distinguish between a fixed mindset (the belief that abilities cannot be changed) and a growth mindset (the belief that abilities can be developed through effort and experience). They argue that which mindset a person develops depends mostly on their environment and experiences while growing up. This idea is central to the present study: if the mindset is shaped by the environment, then differences in environmental context, including historical and institutional differences, should produce different patterns of mindset development.

Three main groups of factors have been identified as antecedents of the entrepreneurial mindset: genetic and biological factors, family socialisation, and acquired skills through education and experience. For the purposes of this paper, the most relevant finding from the genetics literature is that of Lindquist et al. (2015), who studied both biological and adopted children in Sweden. They found that the environment after birth is twice as important as genetic factors in explaining who becomes an entrepreneur. This means that if the environment is disrupted, as it was in communist Romania, the effects on mindset development should be significant.

2.2. Family Socialisation and the Problem of Positive Transmission

The family is generally considered to be the most important socialisation environment for entrepreneurial values and behaviours (Cardella, Hernández-Sánchez et al., 2020). Research shows that having entrepreneurial parents increases the probability of becoming an entrepreneur by 60 per cent (Lindquist et al., 2015). Laspita et al. (2012) found that parental entrepreneurship is positively associated with children's entrepreneurial intentions and suggested that this intergenerational transmission may occur through family socialization, exposure to self-employment, and the transmission of values and business knowledge. Maziriri et al. (2022), in a qualitative study with South African entrepreneurial couples, found that entrepreneurial parents actively encourage their children's entrepreneurial development through specific activities and everyday exposure to business thinking. However, all this research assumes that the family influence works through *positive* transmission: entrepreneurial parents teaching and inspiring their children. The literature does not really examine what happens when parents are not entrepreneurs for reasons that are not their own choice but are imposed by the political system. Shepherd and Haynie (2009) showed that identity conflicts within families can accelerate entrepreneurial processes. Bandura (2012) explains in his social cognitive theory that people learn not only from positive models (people they want to imitate) but also from negative models (situations or people they want to avoid). In Romania, where the communist system prevented the parent generation from developing entrepreneurial lives, many children grew up watching their parents live constrained, unfulfilling working lives. The present study argues that this created a strong motivation to become something different – what the authors call *negative* *parental identification*, which is defined as the process by which individuals develop entrepreneurial motivation through the conscious rejection of a non-entrepreneurial parental trajectory (Lindquist et al., 2015), using the parent’s constrained or unfulfilled working life as a negative reference point rather than a positive model (Bandura, 2012; Shepherd and Haynie, 2009)

2.3. Early Economic Experience
A second pathway that has received less attention is early participation in real economic activities. Financial socialisation research shows that direct economic participation in childhood has lasting effects on adult behaviour (Webley and Nyhus, 2006). Rae (2006) applied this to entrepreneurship: competence develops mainly through real practice, not theory. Cope (2005) found that the most important entrepreneurial learning comes from events with real practical consequences. Gibb (2002) made this point most clearly: entrepreneurial learning requires real immersion in economic life, not simulation. A child who sells vegetables at a market and handles real money is having a completely different experience from one who plays Monopoly or uses a toy cash register. Thus, early real-money market participation is understood as direct involvement in real economic transactions — earning, selling, managing money, or negotiating in actual market contexts — occurring before the age of 18 (Webley and Nyhus, 2006; Cope, 2005), independently of formal education (Gibb, 2002) and without requiring an entrepreneurial family background.

2.4. Context: Post-Communist Romania
Welter (2011) argues that context is not just a background condition for entrepreneurship research, it is part of what makes entrepreneurship what it is. The historical, institutional, and social environment shapes not only what opportunities entrepreneurs see, but also how they understand themselves as entrepreneurs. Smallbone and Welter (2001) suggest that communist institutional and social legacies weakened the social conditions under which entrepreneurial values and practices could be reproduced, while making informal networks especially important in transition economies. Peng (2003) argued that major institutional changes, like the transition from communism to a market economy, change the way people think about what is possible in economic life.
Romania is a particularly useful case for studying these questions because the communist period ended at a specific known point (1989), which makes it possible to clearly distinguish between the generation that grew up under communism (the parents in this study) and the generation that grew up after it (the participants in this study). According to national experts, entrepreneurship education at primary and secondary school level in Romania is below average compared to other EU countries, and the main problems are that young people have little exposure to entrepreneurship and very few role models (Ille, 2021). This means that the first post-communist generation in Romania faced two problems at the same time: their families could not pass on entrepreneurial values because of communism, and the school system did not provide strong entrepreneurship education either.

3. Methodology
The study focused on entrepreneurs currently active in Iași, Romania. Three criteria were used to select participants: they had to identify themselves as entrepreneurs

with at least three years of business experience; they had to be Romanian citizens; and they had to be between 18 and 35 years old. The age criterion was chosen for theoretical reasons. People born between 1988 and 2001 are the first generation to have grown up entirely in a post-communist Romania, while their parents grew up under communism. This makes them an ideal group for studying how entrepreneurial mindset develops in the absence of family entrepreneurial tradition. A total of thirteen participants were selected through purposive sampling (Saunders et al., 2016). The participants came from different sectors, including automotive services, IT, property management, garment production, trade, and photography.
The analytical method used is reflexive thematic analysis, which is well suited for identifying patterns across a set of interviews (Smith et al., 2009).
Data were collected through semi-structured individual interviews. The interview guide covered the following topics: what motivated participants to become entrepreneurs; how they define the entrepreneurial mindset; what role they think genetics plays; how their family upbringing influenced them; and what role education, work experience, and role models played. Interviews were done in Romanian or English, depending on what the participant preferred. The data were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006, 2019).

Table 1: Sample characteristics

Characteristic	Detail
Number of participants	13
Age range	22–35 years
Birth cohort	1988–2001
Gender	10 male, 3 female
Location	Iași, Romania
Business experience	Minimum 3 years
Sectors	Automotive, IT, property management, garment manufacturing, trade, photography, other
Sampling method	Purposive
Data collection	Semi-structured interviews (Romanian and English)

Source: authors' own research

4. Findings
The analysis produced two main themes. Each theme represents a different way in which participants developed an entrepreneurial mindset without the support of family entrepreneurial tradition. Theme 1, negative parental identification, was the most common pattern, appearing in eight of the thirteen participants. Theme 2, early real-money market participation, was the main developmental mechanism for five participants. In several cases, both themes were present at the same time.

4.1. Theme 1: Negative Parental Identification

The most consistent pattern in the data was that participants did not become entrepreneurs because of positive examples in their families, but because they wanted to live differently from their parents. In most cases, the parent generation was seen as capable and intelligent but limited. Their parents had not been able to develop entrepreneurial careers because the political system did not allow it. Many of these parents were now living with regret. Participants described their own decision to become entrepreneurs as a direct response to seeing this situation. This is what the authors call *negative parental identification*: becoming an entrepreneur not by following a role model, but by refusing to repeat a trajectory.

P1, aged 28, who runs an automotive service business, gave one of the clearest descriptions of this mechanism. His parents, a doctor and a former rally driver, were not entrepreneurs:

“My parents were not entrepreneurs. Even though I saw in them some entrepreneurial capabilities, they were limited by the fear of taking certain risks. Previous generations, in general, are inclined towards stability, seeking security in life and being satisfied with being employees. I saw them as capable, but also quite scared of failure and with certain regrets, now in their old age. My motivation came from the fact that I set out to take certain risks rather than have regrets.”

When asked what had prevented his parents from being entrepreneurs, P1 gave a direct answer:

“Certainly, living in the communist era where being an entrepreneur was not possible played a significant role. In the best-case scenario, you could be a section manager in a factory, but we cannot really consider that entrepreneurship. In general, free thinking and individual initiative were quite limited.”

This account shows how the mechanism works. The parent’s non-entrepreneurship is not explained as a personal weakness, but as something imposed by the political context. And the child’s entrepreneurship is presented as completing something the parent could not do. It is also interesting that P1 chose Horatio Pagani as his role model – a man who was an employee at Lamborghini, was prevented from developing his ideas there, and then created his own company. This is the same story P1 tells about himself and his father.

P6, aged 35, who runs an IT business and whose parents were a doctor and a teacher, described the same situation in simpler terms:

“Growing up in a family where my parents were a doctor and a teacher, I did not have a direct entrepreneurial influence. I wanted to have control over my work and be able to make a direct impact through my own business. While they were not entrepreneurs themselves, their support and guidance helped me develop a strong work ethic.”

P7, who had no entrepreneurs in his family at all, described how the family environment can transmit limiting beliefs that work against entrepreneurial thinking:

“I am quite certain that family, especially education, can influence both positively and negatively towards the entrepreneurial mindset. I can firmly mention a phrase that many of us probably heard when we were young: "Be content with what you have" – which can have a negative influence and act as scissors that cut off a thought or its inception.”

P7 also explained that he attributed his entrepreneurial drive to his own nature, since he had no entrepreneurial family model to point to. This is a significant pattern: when

there is no positive family example available, participants often explain their entrepreneurial motivation as something that came from inside themselves. Bandura’s (2012) social cognitive theory helps explain this: both positive and negative examples shape behaviour, and in the absence of positive ones, the negative examples, such as the regret and limitation of a parent’s employee life, can be equally powerful.
P8, aged 29, whose parents were both teachers, described very clearly how his family failed to prepare him for entrepreneurship:
“Coming from a family with weak financial education, I could say that education was at the level of a financial counter-example. Although my family was excellent intellectually, they prepared me well in terms of personal growth but not for entrepreneurship. They gave me the capacity to learn and acquire knowledge, but they did not make me an entrepreneur.”
P8 also described how his family and social environment had passed on limiting beliefs about money, such as "Money does not bring happiness" and "Money does not grow on trees". He had to actively work against these beliefs through years of self-directed study before he could develop an entrepreneurial mindset. This shows that negative parental identification can work at the level of beliefs and values, not only at the level of biographical choices.
P4, aged 28, who runs a property management company, described his motivation in terms of escaping the limitations of employment:
“I did not like having to report to someone or have a boss checking my every move. Ever since I became aware of the concept of money, I always wanted to reach a point where it would not be solely dependent on whether we had money or not.”
P12, aged 32, gave the most developed version of this idea, describing employment itself as the opposite of what he wanted to be:
“The lack of the entrepreneurial approach leads to the typical problems of a fixed salary grid, selling time for money, often for less than the value of one’s work, with limited freedom and creativity. There is no such thing as an ideal job or career. You create your ideal activity, and the entrepreneurial approach is the only context in which you can do that.”
In summary, these accounts all describe the same basic mechanism. When the parent generation was prevented from entrepreneurship by the communist system, and when their children could see the costs of this regret, dependence, limited freedom, unfulfilled potential, this created a strong motivation to choose a different path. The drive to become an entrepreneur came not from admiration for an entrepreneurial parent, but from the decision not to become what the parent had become.

4.2. Theme 2: Early Real-Money Market Participation

In five cases, participants described early direct experience with real economic transactions as an important developmental mechanism. These experiences happened when participants were between 7 and 16 years old. They were very different from formal education or from the games and toys that parents sometimes use to teach children about money. They involved real money, real markets, and real consequences, which created the kind of experiential learning that Rae (2006) and Cope (2005) identify as the most effective way to develop entrepreneurial competence.

The clearest example is P10, who learned about business by going with his grandmother to the local agricultural market:

“Working in the garden, having the patience to wait for a seed to bear fruit, monetizing that produce at the agricultural market, and spending that money were the first and most important activities in developing my entrepreneurial skills. Overcoming the inner resistance of the ego to sell the products displayed on your stall in the market is also crucial.”

P10 explicitly connected this early experience to his entrepreneurial mindset. He described learning communication skills, how to approach customers, and how to solve problems through these real market interactions. His grandmother was not an entrepreneur; the market itself was the learning environment.

P7 provided a remarkable example of spontaneous entrepreneurial behaviour at the age of 7 or 8:

“My mother managed to buy me a second-hand bicycle. After a week of riding it every day, I got bored and seeing the desire and request of other kids who did not have a bicycle, I rented it to them for 1 leu per block tour.”

This episode is interesting for several reasons. P7 was not taught to do this by anyone. He identified a demand, created a service, set a price, and managed a small business spontaneously. He came from a family with no entrepreneurial tradition. And when he recalled this story as an adult, he connected it to his later entrepreneurial development. The logic of seeing an opportunity and acting on it was already present in him as a young child, developed not through family teaching but through direct contact with the economic reality around him.

P4 started earning money at the age of 16 by working as a photographer at events. He described clearly what this experience taught him:

“I think it helped me a lot that I started earning my own money at a young age. With their support, I reinvested everything I earned into equipment and gear. Around the age of 17, I bought my first professional-grade camera, which cost around 10,000 lei. These experiences taught me to organise my finances, understand the importance of reinvestments, and also that "to make money, you have to spend/invest money". To progress, you need to have financial organisation, and that is a practical, tangible thing.”

P4 learned about capital allocation, the importance of reinvesting, and financial organisation through real economic activity, not through a classroom. His parents were not entrepreneurs, but by guiding him to reinvest his earnings rather than spend them on consumption, they helped him develop a genuinely entrepreneurial relationship with money.

P11, aged 34, described how his childhood participation in agricultural and household economic activities shaped his entrepreneurial development:

“My own evolution as an entrepreneur has been a continuous and systematic process, starting from childhood when I was involved in agricultural activities, household chores, and engaging in buying and selling the necessary items for my parents’ household.”

P13 described a similar experience: "One of them I had since I was little was looking to do something that was needed for money like gathering fruits to sell them to my neighbours." And P5 described how even everyday negotiations within the family helped him develop a commercial way of thinking: "The negotiations of the times to enter the house, the negotiations of the pocket money, that ‘Product’ that I always had to show and that I wanted my parents, my clients from those times, to ‘buy’ it."

What connects all these cases is the presence of *real economic stakes*: real money, real decisions, and real consequences. This is fundamentally different from the simulated economic activities – board games, toy cash registers, piggy banks – that the family socialisation literature describes as tools used by entrepreneurial parents to develop their children's mindsets (Maziriri et al., 2022). As Gibb (2002) argues, real entrepreneurial learning comes from real immersion in economic life, not from simulating it.

4.3. The Relationship Between the Two Pathways

The two pathways are not separate and often appear together. P7, P10, and P4 all show signs of both: they came from non-entrepreneurial families (Theme 1) and they also had early experiences with real money and markets (Theme 2). This suggests a coherent logic: when positive family transmission is absent because of communism, some people develop entrepreneurial motivation through negative identification with the parental trajectory, and at the same time they develop practical economic competence through early market participation.

P8 shows what happens when neither pathway is available in childhood: he had no entrepreneurial parents, no early market experience, and he inherited limiting beliefs about money from his family and community. He only developed an entrepreneurial mindset much later in life, through years of intensive self-directed reading and study. He described this process as rebuilding his entire relationship with money and economic thinking from the beginning. This negative case supports the general argument: when both substitute pathways are absent, the development of an entrepreneurial mindset takes longer and requires much more personal effort.

As a contrast, the three participants who did have entrepreneurial parents (P2, P9, P13) all described positive family transmission. P9 said his father was his biggest inspiration, and P13 said he grew up "seeing the advantages of being your own boss" through direct observation. These cases confirm that when the family channel is intact, positive transmission works as the literature describes. The substitute pathways described in this paper appear specifically when the family channel is not available.

5. Discussion

The findings of this study contribute to the entrepreneurial mindset literature in two ways. First, they show that the model of family socialisation described in most existing research, where entrepreneurial parents pass on values, knowledge, and motivation to their children, works well only in specific contexts. In stable Western market economies, this positive transmission model describes well how entrepreneurial mindsets develop. But in Romania, where communism broke the chain of intergenerational transmission, most participants did not have entrepreneurial parents, and so this model does not apply. Instead, participants developed entrepreneurial motivation through a different mechanism: seeing the costs of the employee-bound lives of their parents and deciding to choose a different path. The parent generation's visible regret, limited freedom, and unfulfilled potential became a motivation for the next generation rather than a neutral background.

This finding extends Shepherd and Haynie (2009), who showed that identity conflicts in family contexts can drive entrepreneurial choices. The present study identifies a prior mechanism: entrepreneurial aspiration built not against an inherited business role, but against the image of a limited, employee-bound life the participant is determined to avoid. Bandura’s (2012) social cognitive theory is consistent with this finding, since it recognises that negative models can be just as influential as positive ones. However, this mechanism has not been studied in transition economies, where negative models are produced by political history rather than individual family circumstances.

Second, the findings document early real-money market participation as a distinct mechanism for entrepreneurial mindset development. This is different from what the literature usually describes. Existing research on family socialisation focuses on deliberate activities by entrepreneurial parents – games, competitions, exposure to business conversations (Maziriri et al., 2022). What this study found is a third category: direct participation in real markets, often without any formal design or entrepreneurial family background, that produces genuine economic learning. In Romania, the agricultural market and the informal economy provided access to this kind of real economic experience precisely for young people whose families could not offer entrepreneurial role models or business knowledge.

These findings support Welter’s (2011) contextualisation argument: what drives entrepreneurial mindset development depends on the institutional history of the place. Romania is not unique; other post-communist countries in Central and Eastern Europe such as Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, the Baltic states have experienced similar interruptions of entrepreneurial tradition. The pathways identified here may be relevant in those contexts too.

For entrepreneurship education policy, the findings have a practical message. Many entrepreneurship education programmes that are used in Eastern Europe were designed for Western contexts where students typically have more family exposure to business, more positive entrepreneurial role models, and more formal economic knowledge. If the actual developmental backgrounds of students in Romania and similar countries look more like what this study describes, motivation driven by wanting to avoid an employee trajectory, and early practical economic experience as the main source of business knowledge, then programmes should be designed to match these realities. This might mean using biographical reflection about family trajectories as a motivational tool, building on students’ existing market experience, and prioritising real market immersion over classroom instruction.

6. Conclusions

This paper argued that communism’s interruption of entrepreneurial family tradition in Romania did not prevent the development of entrepreneurial mindsets. Based on thirteen interviews with the first post-communist generation of Romanian entrepreneurs, the study identified two substitute pathways: negative parental identification, where motivation comes from refusing to repeat the limited lives of parents who could not be entrepreneurs under communism; and early real-money market participation, where children develop practical business understanding through real economic activities outside any family entrepreneurial tradition.

The study makes two contributions. Theoretically, it shows that the antecedents of the entrepreneurial mindset depend on historical and institutional context, and that when the normal family transmission pathway is broken, people develop systematic alternative pathways that existing theory has not explained. Empirically, it provides a qualitative study of how entrepreneurial mindsets developed in the Romanian post-

communist generation, based on detailed interview data that allows the mechanisms to be traced through individual life histories.
The findings of this study are exploratory in nature. With thirteen participants from one city, the study does not claim to build or validate theory. Instead, it identifies two patterns that appear consistently in the data and that existing theory has not described. These patterns — negative parental identification and early real-money market participation — are offered as empirical observations that future research may develop further, test in other contexts, or use as a basis for more formal theoretical work. Researchers working in other post-communist countries are encouraged to examine whether similar patterns appear in their contexts, and under what conditions they may be stronger or weaker. Two further limitations relate to the composition of the sample. First, all participants are currently active entrepreneurs. People who had similar family backgrounds but did not become entrepreneurs, or who tried and failed, are not represented in the data. This means the study can describe pathways that led to entrepreneurship but cannot explain why some people with the same background chose a different path. Second, the study has no comparison group of non-entrepreneurs. Without this, it is not possible to say with certainty that the two pathways identified — negative parental identification and early market participation — are specifically linked to entrepreneurial outcomes, or whether they are simply common experiences among young people who grew up in post-communist Romania regardless of whether they became entrepreneurs. Future research using a comparative design, including both entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs from similar backgrounds, would help to clarify this
Future research should test whether the two pathways found in this study are also present in other post-communist countries. It would also be useful to study whether these pathways work differently for women, since research suggests that women’s entrepreneurial development in transition economies follows different patterns. Longitudinal studies that follow people from childhood to adulthood would provide stronger evidence about how early economic experiences connect to later entrepreneurial mindset development. Studies comparing first-generation entrepreneurs (with no entrepreneurial parents) and second-generation entrepreneurs (who inherited family business tradition) would also help to clarify the specific role of each pathway.

References

1. Bandura, A. (2012) “On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited”, Journal of Management, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 9–44.
2. Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) “Using thematic analysis in psychology”, Qualitative Research in Psychology, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 77–101.
3. Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2019) “Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis”, Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 589–597.
4. Cardella, G. M., Hernández-Sánchez, B. R. and Sánchez García, J. C. (2020) “Entrepreneurship and family role: A systematic review of a growing research”, Frontiers in Psychology, Vol. 10, Article 2939.
5. Cope, J. (2005) “Toward a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship”, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 373–397.

6. Daspit, J. J., Fox, C. J. and Findley, S. K. (2021) "Entrepreneurial mindset: An integrated definition, a review of current insights, and directions for future research", Journal of Small Business Management, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 12–44.
7. Davis, M. H., Hall, J. A. and Mayer, P. S. (2016) "Developing a new measure of entrepreneurial mindset: Reliability, validity, and implications for practitioners", Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, Vol. 68, No. 1, pp. 21–48.
8. Dweck, C. S. and Yeager, D. S. (2019) "Mindsets: A view from two eras", Perspectives on Psychological Science, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 481–496.
9. Gibb, A. A. (2002) "In pursuit of a new enterprise and entrepreneurship paradigm for learning", International Journal of Management Reviews, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 213–231.
10. Ille, C. (2021) "Trends and perspectives on entrepreneurial education in Romania and the EU", The Annals of the University of Oradea. Economic Sciences, Tom XXX, 2nd Issue, December, pp. 54–64
11. Laspita, S., Breugst, N., Heblich, S. and Patzelt, H. (2012) "Intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial intentions", Journal of Business Venturing, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 414–435.
12. Lindquist, M. J., Sol, J. and Van Praag, M. (2015) "Why do entrepreneurial parents have entrepreneurial children?", Journal of Labor Economics, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 269–296.
13. Maziriri, E. T., Nyagadza, B., Maramura, T. C. and Mapuranga, M. (2022) "Like mom and dad: Using narrative analysis to understand how couplepreneurs stimulate their kids' entrepreneurial mindset", Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, Vol. 14, No. 5, pp. 818–840.
14. Peng, M. W. (2003) "Institutional transitions and strategic choices", Academy of Management Review, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 275–296.
15. Rae, D. (2006) "Entrepreneurial learning: A conceptual framework for technology-based enterprise", Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 39–56.
16. Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2016) Research Methods for Business Students (7th ed.), Pearson, Harlow.
17. Shepherd, D. A. and Haynie, J. M. (2009) "Family business, identity conflict, and an expedited entrepreneurial process", Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Vol. 33, No. 6, pp. 1245–1264.
18. Smallbone, D. and Welter, F. (2001) "The distinctiveness of entrepreneurship in transition economies", Small Business Economics, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 249–262.
19. Smith, J. A., Flowers, P. and Larkin, M. (2009) Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research, Sage, London.
20. Webley, P. and Nyhus, E. K. (2006) "Parents' influence on children's future orientation and saving", Journal of Economic Psychology, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 140–164.
21. Welter, F. (2011) "Contextualizing entrepreneurship — conceptual challenges and ways forward", Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 165–184.