



Understanding the Entrepreneurial Mindset: A Review of Psychological Factors and the Moderating Role of Organizational Support

Du Man^{a*}, Gary Tan Peng Liang^b

^{a,b}*Malaysia University of Science and Technology (MUST), Block B, Encorp Strand Garden Office, No. 12, Jalan
PJU 5/5, Kota Damansara, 47810 Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia*

^a*Email: du.man@phd.must.edu.my*

Abstract

The entrepreneurial mindset (EM) is increasingly recognized as a critical driver of innovation, adaptability, and strategic leadership, particularly in service-oriented industries facing dynamic change. This systematic literature review explores the psychological antecedents of EM—specifically entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE), emotional intelligence (EI), and mindfulness—and examines the moderating role of perceived organizational support (POS). Drawing on peer-reviewed studies published between 2010 and 2024, this review integrates findings from psychology, entrepreneurship, and organizational behavior to address three core questions: (1) Which psychological traits are most reliably linked to EM? (2) How does POS influence the strength or direction of these relationships? (3) What theoretical frameworks and methodologies dominate this field? The review identifies ESE as the most consistent predictor of EM, while EI and mindfulness enhance emotional regulation and opportunity recognition. POS appears to strengthen the link between these traits and EM, yet its moderating role remains underexplored. Methodologically, the field relies heavily on cross-sectional survey data and Western theoretical models, limiting causal inferences and cultural generalizability. The review highlights key gaps in longitudinal research, theoretical integration, and cultural calibration—particularly in emerging economies such as China.

Received: 7/6/2025

Accepted: 9/6/2025

Published: 9/16/2025

** Corresponding author.*

It concludes by proposing a future research agenda aimed at developing holistic, context-sensitive models of entrepreneurial cognition and behavior.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Mindset; Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy, Emotional Intelligence, Mindfulness, Perceived Organizational Support

1. Introduction

The concept of the entrepreneurial mindset (EM) has become more important in research on organizations and management, especially in service-driven industries that are going through rapid changes in technology and the economy. The entrepreneurial mindset is often described as a way of thinking and acting that includes being able to see opportunities, encourage innovation, show resilience, and be willing to take calculated risk [1]. In the service sector, where innovation cycles are short and customers are more involved, EM is especially important for effective management and flexible organizations. Even though more and more people are realizing how important EM is for promoting innovation and flexibility in organizations, the psychological factors that help it grow still need more research. People often talk about important ideas like emotional intelligence (EI), entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE), and mindfulness. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE), emotional intelligence (EI), and mindfulness are all important personal-level factors that affect EM. However, the current literature does not provide a full picture of how these factors are related. Perceived organizational support (POS) is another factor that may affect the relationship between psychological traits and EM. POS is how much employees think the organization cares about their well-being and values their work [2]. This systematic literature review (SLR) tries to fill in these gaps by bringing together empirical studies on the psychological factors that affect EM and the moderating effect of POS.

This review aims to address these research questions:

- (1) Which psychological factors are reliably linked to EM?
- (2) In what ways does POS influence the connection between these factors and EM?
- (3) What are the dominant theoretical models and research methods employed in this area?

This assessment also seeks to emphasize theoretical and methodological deficiencies and suggest a future research agenda, especially regarding transitional economies like China.

2. Review Scope and Method

This review draws upon a carefully curated selection of scholarly literature published between 2010 and 2024 across the fields of psychology, management, entrepreneurship, and organizational behavior. Its central focus lies in examining the psychological underpinnings of the entrepreneurial mindset (EM), specifically entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE), emotional intelligence (EI), and mindfulness. Additionally, the review explores the potential moderating role of perceived organizational support (POS) in shaping or strengthening the relationships between

these psychological variables and EM. By integrating findings from various academic disciplines, the review aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of how both individual-level psychological traits and contextual organizational factors influence entrepreneurial thinking and behavior, particularly in service-driven industries.

To ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant literature, a multi-database search strategy was implemented. Major academic databases such as Scopus and Web of Science were utilized for their extensive indexing of high-impact, peer-reviewed journals across multiple disciplines. These were complemented by searches in EBSCOhost and ProQuest, which provided deeper access to studies within the domains of management and applied psychology. In addition, CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure) was included to capture regionally significant research, particularly from Chinese scholars working in the relevant domains. Google Scholar was also used as a supplementary tool, particularly for snowballing techniques, citation chaining, and identifying additional peer-reviewed studies not captured in the core databases.

The search strategy employed a Boolean logic-based keyword structure, using various combinations of terms to ensure comprehensive retrieval of relevant publications. The key terms included “entrepreneurial mindset” in conjunction with “self-efficacy” or “entrepreneurial self-efficacy,” “emotional intelligence” or “EI,” “mindfulness,” and “perceived organizational support” or “POS.” This approach allowed the search to encompass a wide range of studies that investigate the conceptual relationships at the heart of the review.

To ensure academic rigor and relevance, strict inclusion criteria were applied to the selection of studies. Only studies published between 2010 and 2024 were considered, to ensure the findings were situated within contemporary theoretical and empirical developments. Each included article had to examine at least one core psychological construct—entrepreneurial self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, or mindfulness—as it related to EM. Studies that investigated POS either as a moderator or as an independent factor influencing entrepreneurial behavior were also included. Furthermore, all selected studies needed to be situated within organizational, managerial, or service industry contexts to align with the applied focus of the review. Both empirical studies—whether quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods—and well-cited theoretical papers that contributed meaningfully to conceptual understanding were considered eligible. Only English-language publications were included, though CNKI was searched to identify Chinese-authored studies that met the thematic and methodological standards and were available in English or with translated abstracts.

Conversely, a set of exclusion criteria was used to filter out studies that lacked relevance or methodological soundness. Non-peer-reviewed works such as blog entries, opinion pieces, editorials, and unpublished theses were excluded to preserve academic integrity. The review also excluded theoretical papers that lacked clear citations or empirical grounding, as well as empirical studies with insufficient methodological transparency regarding sampling, data collection, or analysis. Studies conducted in non-organizational contexts—such as those focusing on educational settings, student populations, or clinical samples—were also excluded, as they did not align with the managerial or service-based orientation of the review. Duplicate studies or overlapping publications based on the same datasets were removed to avoid redundancy and potential bias.

Following the screening and selection process, the final pool of studies was subjected to thematic synthesis. Each

article was reviewed and coded based on key criteria such as research design, theoretical framework, sample population, variable definitions, and major findings. This process enabled the identification of recurrent themes, such as the direct impact of ESE on EM, or the potential for POS to buffer the effects of environmental stressors on entrepreneurial behaviors. These themes formed the backbone of the review's analytical structure and provided insight into the conceptual coherence and fragmentation across the literature. Ultimately, the thematic synthesis not only illuminated areas of convergence and divergence among existing studies but also highlighted critical gaps that point to opportunities for future research.

3. Thematic Findings

3.1 Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (ESE) and EM

Entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE), grounded in Bandura's self-efficacy theory, refers to an individual's belief in their ability to successfully perform entrepreneurial tasks. High ESE consistently correlates with entrepreneurial intention, opportunity recognition, and innovative behavior. References [3] found ESE significantly influences entrepreneurial learning and intent. Similarly, [4] showed that ESE mediates the effect of prior experience on EM. More recently, [5] confirmed that ESE plays a key role in psychological capital and entrepreneurial intention. References [6,7]. also identified ESE as a top psychological predictor of entrepreneurial behavior, particularly in technical and youth populations.

3.2 Emotional Intelligence (EI) and EM

Emotional intelligence (EI), the capacity to understand and regulate emotions, contributes significantly to EM by enhancing resilience, interpersonal skills, and strategic decision-making. References [8] found that high EI leads to superior opportunity recognition and negotiation capabilities. References [9] extended this finding in female entrepreneurs, noting that emotional adaptability and empathy foster entrepreneurial motivation. References [6] linked EI with balanced decision-making among engineering students. References [7] and [10] noted that self-awareness, a core component of EI, strengthens entrepreneurial confidence and initiative.

3.3 Mindfulness and EM

Mindfulness—defined as conscious, non-judgmental awareness of the present moment—supports EM by improving cognitive flexibility and emotional regulation. References [11] highlighted mindfulness as a key enhancer of adaptive decision-making in entrepreneurial uncertainty. References [12] found that mindfulness moderated the relationship between EI and behavior, boosting entrepreneurial follow-through. References [13] noted that present-moment awareness helps students manage ambiguity, fostering initiative. References [14] suggested mindfulness improves creativity and ideation in sustainable ventures. References [15] linked mindfulness with improved goal implementation in early-stage entrepreneurship.

3.4 Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and its Moderating Role

POS reflects employees' beliefs about how much their organization values their contributions and well-being.

References [16] showed that high POS fosters innovation and proactive behavior. References [17] provided meta-analytic evidence linking POS with psychological empowerment and risk-taking. References [18] Alwiya and his colleagues, emphasized the role of POS in entrepreneurial cultures within startups. References [19] suggested POS enhances the effects of educational experiences on entrepreneurial mindset. References [20] proposed POS as a boundary condition that could moderate the effects of personal traits like EI and mindfulness on EM, though this remains empirically underexplored.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Which psychological factors are reliably linked to EM?

The entrepreneurial mindset (EM) is increasingly recognized as a psychological configuration shaped by individual-level traits that promote initiative, innovation, and adaptability. Among these, internal locus of control (LoC) and risk tolerance are frequently cited as foundational psychological drivers. Grounded in frameworks such as social cognitive theory and the theory of planned behavior, these constructs help explain how individuals interpret uncertainty and convert intention into entrepreneurial behavior.

Internal locus of control refers to the belief that outcomes are contingent upon one's own actions. Individuals with a strong internal LoC are more likely to perceive themselves as agents of change, a perspective that fosters proactivity, persistence, and confidence in uncertain environments. Empirical evidence consistently demonstrates the positive relationship between internal LoC and entrepreneurial intention. For instance, recent studies by

Reference [21, 10] show that internal LoC predicts not only intention but also alertness and opportunity recognition—key antecedents to entrepreneurial action. References [22,23], further elaborate that internal LoC significantly correlates with psychological capital (PsyCap), suggesting that self-directed individuals are also more likely to possess resilience, optimism, and hope—traits that enhance long-term entrepreneurial persistence.

Importantly, [21] adopt a chain mediation model to demonstrate that LoC indirectly influences entrepreneurial intention through its effects on both alertness and opportunity recognition. This layered structure offers a more dynamic understanding of how LoC operates beyond simple direct pathways. In addition, [24] found that internal LoC moderates the relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE) and intention to start a business. Their findings affirm the role of LoC as a cognitive boundary condition that strengthens belief-action alignment.

Despite these contributions, there are gaps in the treatment of external LoC, which may carry functional value in collectivist or hierarchical cultures where group affiliation and social structure strongly influence behavior. Furthermore, many of the findings rely heavily on self-report data gathered through cross-sectional surveys, which are limited in establishing causality and are prone to bias. This methodological shortcoming signals the need for longitudinal and experimental designs in future research.

Risk tolerance—defined as the willingness to engage in uncertain or potentially adverse ventures—is another salient trait influencing the entrepreneurial mindset. It is especially relevant in fast-moving and unpredictable environments where opportunity often coexists with high ambiguity. References [25] examined this trait using

partial least squares structural equation modeling and demonstrated that risk tolerance is positively associated with entrepreneurial intention and knowledge acquisition. Their study also identifies attitude and passion as additional psychological inputs, reinforcing the multidimensional nature of entrepreneurial cognition.

Beyond intention, risk tolerance appears to function as a mediating variable in the relationship between LoC and innovativeness. References [26] showed that those with higher internal LoC are more likely to tolerate risk, which in turn enables them to engage in more innovative behavior. This finding positions risk tolerance as a “bridge trait”—a mechanism that translates cognitive control beliefs into entrepreneurial action. Likewise, [27] suggest that individuals with higher risk tolerance tend to pursue novel opportunities more aggressively, especially in volatile service-oriented industries. However, they caution that unchecked risk-taking can lead to impulsive decision-making and business failure, underlining the need for a balanced, strategic approach.

Despite its explanatory value, the construct of risk tolerance is often treated unidimensionally in empirical research. In practice, entrepreneurs may tolerate different kinds of risk—financial, social, or reputational—in varying degrees. This over-aggregation limits the nuance of current models. Future research should work toward disaggregating risk tolerance into its component dimensions to better understand how these operate across entrepreneurial contexts.

A number of critical limitations remain in the literature. Most notably, the overreliance on cross-sectional survey designs (e.g., in studies by [10,23]) restricts the ability to establish causality or track the development of EM over time. Moreover, relatively few studies explicitly test for interaction effects, such as how risk tolerance moderates the relationship between LoC and innovative outcomes. Addressing these limitations could deepen understanding of the conditional dynamics at play in entrepreneurial cognition.

Another area that warrants attention is cultural bias. While research by [28,29] explores collectivist settings, the bulk of evidence still comes from Western contexts, where values such as autonomy and individual control are more strongly emphasized. Cultural dimensions such as power distance or uncertainty avoidance likely influence how LoC and risk tolerance are perceived and expressed—issues that are insufficiently addressed in the existing literature.

Entrepreneurship is widely recognized as a key engine of economic growth and innovation, but it is not merely an economic or managerial endeavor. Rather, it is deeply rooted in individual psychology. At the heart of successful entrepreneurship lies what is known as the entrepreneurial mindset—a distinct cognitive and emotional orientation that drives individuals to identify opportunities, take initiative, manage uncertainty, and persist in the face of adversity. A growing body of empirical literature has explored how various psychological traits and dispositions shape entrepreneurial intentions and behaviors.

One of the most consistently emphasized psychological constructs in entrepreneurial research is self-efficacy, or the belief in one’s ability to organize and execute the necessary actions to achieve specific goals. Entrepreneurs with high self-efficacy are more likely to view challenges as surmountable and act confidently in ambiguous environments. Studies by Fernandez-Paredes and his colleagues. [7], Liang and his colleagues. [6], and Akbari

and his colleagues. [7] highlight the central role of self-efficacy in both the intention to launch a business and the perseverance to sustain it. Closely related is the concept of locus of control, where individuals with an internal locus believe that they can influence outcomes through their own efforts. Entrepreneurs tend to exhibit a strong internal locus, feeling empowered to shape their futures rather than attributing success to external circumstances Reference [10,30].

Another critical dimension is risk propensity—the degree to which an individual is willing to engage in uncertain ventures—and tolerance for ambiguity. Entrepreneurs regularly operate under conditions of uncertainty, making these traits crucial to venture creation and innovation [31,32]. Complementing this is the need for achievement, a motivational drive that fuels goal-oriented behavior and the pursuit of excellence. Individuals with high achievement motivation are often propelled to innovate, outperform, and create impact [7,33].

Entrepreneurs are also frequently characterized by a high degree of resilience, which enables them to recover from failures and persist through setbacks. This resilience is part of a broader construct known as psychological capital, which also includes hope and optimism—factors that sustain goal-directed energy and positive expectations for the future [5,34,15]. The ability to think creatively and generate innovative solutions further differentiates successful entrepreneurs. Divergent thinking and openness to new experiences facilitate opportunity recognition and novel business ideation [14].

In addition, self-esteem and a strong entrepreneurial identity can shape how individuals view their capacity to lead and innovate. Those who see themselves as capable and worthy are more likely to take the entrepreneurial leap and sustain their efforts over time [7,35]. This aligns with the increasingly studied trait of growth mindset, which is the belief that abilities can be developed through effort and learning. Entrepreneurs with this mindset are more resilient in the face of failure and more open to feedback and iteration [7].

Emotional regulation also plays a role. Emotional intelligence, or the ability to perceive, understand, and manage one's own emotions and those of others, contributes to effective leadership, team dynamics, and negotiation—all vital elements in entrepreneurship [6,9]. Finally, while not strictly psychological, perceived social support and embeddedness in a community can enhance entrepreneurial confidence and motivation, acting as buffers against isolation and discouragement [13,9].

A critical review of this literature reveals several strengths. These studies successfully integrate a wide range of psychological constructs, from personality traits and cognitive beliefs to emotional capacities and social perceptions. Many apply established theoretical frameworks such as the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) or Psychological Capital Theory, adding conceptual rigor. However, the literature is not without its limitations. Most studies rely on cross-sectional and self-report data, which limit causal interpretations. Moreover, a significant portion of the evidence is drawn from non-Western contexts such as Pakistan, Indonesia, and Iran, raising questions about cultural generalizability.

There are also emerging gaps in the field that warrant further exploration. Areas such as neuroentrepreneurship, metacognition, and longitudinal tracking of entrepreneurial mindset development over time remain under-

researched. Understanding how entrepreneurial cognition evolves across different stages of business development could provide valuable insights into both educational interventions and policy design.

Lastly, the heterogeneity of entrepreneurial activity is underexplored. Many studies implicitly assume that the drivers of EM are the same for all entrepreneurs. Yet the psychological traits required for a necessity-driven entrepreneur in a low-income setting may differ significantly from those of an opportunity-driven founder in a tech startup. Similarly, intrapreneurs operating within established organizations might express LoC and risk tolerance in more constrained or socially mediated ways.

In conclusion, the entrepreneurial mindset is shaped by a robust constellation of psychological factors. Among the most influential are self-efficacy, locus of control, motivation, resilience, and creativity. These traits and dispositions do not operate in isolation; rather, they interact dynamically to influence how individuals perceive opportunities, engage with risks, and persist through challenges. Enhancing psychological development may therefore be just as important as acquiring technical or managerial skills in the pursuit of successful entrepreneurship.

4.2 In what ways does POS influence the connection between these factors and EM?

Understanding the entrepreneurial mindset requires not only examining traits and behaviors but also exploring the theoretical models and research methodologies that underpin this area of study. Across recent literature, scholars have employed a variety of frameworks and methods to capture the multifaceted psychological dimensions that shape entrepreneurial thinking and behavior.

A review of ten prominent studies reveals a diversity of approaches. The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) features heavily, providing a structured lens through which entrepreneurial intention and action can be predicted. References [5] applied this model in a quantitative study using SEM-PLS to show how the entrepreneurial mindset influences psychological capital, particularly resilience and self-efficacy. Similarly, [36] extended TPB by integrating it with Mathisen and Arnulf's mindset model, confirming the role of achievement needs and perceived support in shaping entrepreneurial intent.

In contrast to TPB's rational-action orientation, Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory offers a more interactional view of cognition, behavior, and environment. References [19] used this model to explore how curriculum design and extracurricular activities affect students' entrepreneurial mindsets, using hierarchical regression to identify key variables. Other studies adopted a more conceptual or qualitative lens. References [30] examined entrepreneurial motivation through pull-push and emancipation theories, emphasizing psychological drives such as autonomy and necessity. References [13] explored mindset formation among Indonesian students using interviews, grounded in a cognitive-behavioral lens. References [37] proposed an Attitude Theory-based framework, particularly the Entrepreneurial Attitude Orientation (EAO) model, linking entrepreneurial learning environments to attitude development. This conceptual framework highlights how experiential education can foster an entrepreneurial mindset, underlining the importance of educational context. Similarly, references [20] combined TPB with the Action-Characteristics Model to form a new integrated model of intentional

entrepreneurial action. This theoretical synthesis offered a richer understanding of how intention translates into behavior, bridging gaps between personality and process models.

Despite this conceptual richness, limitations persist. The heavy reliance on TPB, while providing structure and predictability, may constrain the understanding of emotional and spontaneous dimensions of entrepreneurship. Moreover, many studies rely on cross-sectional designs, which limit insights into how entrepreneurial mindsets evolve over time. This is particularly problematic for constructs like self-efficacy and resilience, which are known to develop dynamically. There is also a notable cultural bias, with many models rooted in Western psychology being applied to Asian contexts like Vietnam and Indonesia without sufficient adaptation.

Looking ahead, several areas demand deeper exploration. Neuroscientific tools could offer new insights into how entrepreneurs perceive risk or process failure. Systems-based models might better capture the non-linear, feedback-driven nature of entrepreneurial development. Furthermore, experimental validation of emerging constructs—such as elaborative versus implementing mindsets—would strengthen the empirical foundation of the field.

In conclusion, research into the entrepreneurial mindset employs a broad spectrum of theoretical models and methods, with the Theory of Planned Behavior, Social Cognitive Theory, and attitude-based models being most prominent. While these frameworks have advanced understanding, the field would benefit from more integrative, longitudinal, and culturally calibrated approaches that reflect the complex and evolving nature of entrepreneurial psychology.

4.3 What are the dominant theoretical models and research methods employed in this area?

The study of psychological factors influencing the entrepreneurial mindset is underpinned by a diverse array of theoretical models and research methodologies. These frameworks help explain how cognitive traits, personality dispositions, and social contexts contribute to entrepreneurial behavior and intention.

One of the most dominant models in this field is the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). TPB posits that entrepreneurial intentions are shaped by attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. It has been widely applied in entrepreneurship research to link mindset with action, as seen in [5], who used TPB within a structural equation modeling framework to analyze how psychological capital mediates entrepreneurial mindset formation. This model is also extended by [36], who integrated it with Mathisen and Arnulf's mindset model to explain entrepreneurial intention in Vietnamese students.

Another frequently used framework is Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, which emphasizes the role of self-efficacy, observational learning, and reciprocal determinism. References [19] employed this theory to examine how educational interventions influence students' entrepreneurial beliefs and behaviors, using regression analysis to establish relationships among curriculum design, extracurricular activities, and mindset development.

Attitude Theory and the Entrepreneurial Attitude Orientation (EAO) model are also influential, particularly in studies focusing on educational contexts and psychological readiness. References [37] used the EAO framework

to define components of entrepreneurial attitude such as achievement, innovation, and personal control, providing a lens for experiential education's role in shaping mindset.

Self-Perception Theory, proposed by Bem, has been applied by [38] to explore how internal self-attributions influence entrepreneurial identity. This model explains how individuals infer attitudes from observing their own behavior, thus supporting mindset development.

Personality and Trait Theories also serve as foundational frameworks, especially for studies investigating dispositional predictors of entrepreneurship. References [32] conducted a comprehensive literature review emphasizing the roles of traits like extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness in decision-making processes central to entrepreneurship.

Pull-Push Theory and Emancipation Theory, as used by [37], focus on motivational drivers behind entrepreneurial action. These models distinguish between proactive motivations (pull) like opportunity recognition and reactive motivations (push) such as necessity and unemployment, providing a richer motivational perspective.

Theory of Entrepreneurial Culture was adopted by [18] in a qualitative study exploring Indonesian startup ecosystems. This theory posits that culture shapes entrepreneurial values and psychological predispositions at the societal level.

Finally, integrative models such as the one proposed by [20] combine elements from TPB and Action-Characteristics Theory, offering a comprehensive perspective on how individual characteristics and intentions translate into behavior.

These studies not only diversify the theoretical landscape but also demonstrate a mix of quantitative (e.g., regression, SEM-PLS), qualitative (e.g., interviews, literature syntheses), and conceptual methods.

5. Gaps and Future Research Opportunities

The study of psychological factors influencing the entrepreneurial mindset (EM) is rapidly evolving, but several critical gaps remain. Firstly, cultural and contextual limitations are prominent. Most empirical work is Western-centric, with few studies exploring how EM manifests in non-Western or emerging market contexts like China, Indonesia, or India. References [35] highlights this issue, noting that Anglo-American perspectives dominate EM literature and that cultural recalibration is necessary to enhance global validity.

Secondly, there is a lack of theoretical integration. Many studies examine individual traits or constructs (like self-efficacy, optimism, or mindfulness) in isolation, rather than synthesizing them into a cohesive framework. References [12] demonstrate this fragmentation by focusing solely on mindfulness as a moderator between entrepreneurial intention (EI) and behavior, while other potentially interacting constructs such as perceived organizational support (POS) are not considered.

A further underexplored area is the interaction between individual and organizational-level variables. Specifically,

how POS may moderate the effects of traits like emotional intelligence (EI) and mindfulness on entrepreneurial behavior warrants deeper inquiry. While references [12] suggest mindfulness enhances entrepreneurial execution, they do not explore organizational enablers that might amplify or buffer this relationship.

Methodologically, most research remains cross-sectional, which restricts causal inference. Longitudinal and experimental studies are essential to understanding how the EM evolves over time, particularly in response to interventions like entrepreneurship education or mentoring. References [34] call for more longitudinal designs to explore how psychological resilience develops in entrepreneurial contexts.

Finally, the use of big data and advanced analytics is largely untapped. References [39] argues for the application of psychological big data to uncover regional and cultural patterns of entrepreneurial traits—a promising frontier for both behavioral science and economic geography.

6. Conclusion

This review synthesizes literature on key psychological antecedents of the entrepreneurial mindset—specifically entrepreneurial self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and mindfulness—and examines the emerging role of perceived organizational support. While individual traits are consistently linked to EM, the moderating impact of POS remains an underexplored yet promising area. Addressing these gaps is critical for building holistic models of entrepreneurial development, particularly in dynamic service environments and non-Western economies. Future research should strive for greater theoretical integration, methodological rigor, and cultural relevance.

References

- [1] D. F. Kuratko, J. S. Hornsby, and J. G. Covin, “Diagnosing a firm's internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship,” *Business Horizons*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 37–47, Jan./Feb. 2010.
- [2] R. Eisenberger, R. Huntington, S. Hutchison, and D. Sowa, “Perceived organizational support,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 500–507, 1986.
- [3] F. Wilson, J. Kickul, and D. Marlino, “Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 387–406, 2007.
- [4] M. Drnovšek, M. T. Wincent, and C. Cardon, “Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and business start-up: Developing a multi-dimensional definition,” *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 329–348, 2010.
- [5] M. Zaenuri, I. Sholihah, and M. Syaifuddin, “Implication of entrepreneurial mindset in building psychological capital and strengthening entrepreneurial intention,” 2023.
- [6] C. Liang, J.-H. Wang, and S.-N. Yao, “The contribution of self-efficacy to the relationship between

personality traits and entrepreneurial intention,” *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 82, pp. 120–125, 2015.

- [7] P. Fernández-Pérez, G. Medina-Zaragoza, and J. Travieso-Álvarez, “Emotional competence, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial intention among social entrepreneurs,” *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 11, p. 727826, Apr. 2021.
- [8] R. A. Baron and G. D. Markman, “Beyond social capital: The role of entrepreneurs' social competence in their financial success,” *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 41–60, 2003.
- [9] A. Jan, A. Ahmed, and R. Jabeen, “Emotional intelligence and entrepreneurial intention in female university students: The mediating role of self-efficacy,” *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1–10, 2020.
- [10] K. Kurjono, F. Samlawi, B. Muntashofi, and A. Rahmawati, “The effect of locus of control and tolerance of ambiguity on entrepreneurial intention,” *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, vol. 653, pp. 15–21, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220701.003>
- [11] D. A. Lerner, M. H. Hunt, and S. Dimov, “Mindfulness and entrepreneurial decision-making: A conceptual framework,” *Academy of Management Proceedings*, vol. 2018, no. 1, pp. 11761, 2018.
- [12] W. K. Abdul, M. Laeequddin, and V. Sahay, “Bridging the gap between entrepreneurial intentions and behavior: Examining the role of mindfulness,” *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 2024.
- [13] S. P. K. Dewi and M. A. Nawawi, “Factors affecting the mindset in cultivating management students into entrepreneurs,” 2022.
- [14] Y. Zemlyak, S. Osipova, and L. Kharlamova, “Mindfulness, creativity, and ideation in sustainable entrepreneurship,” *Sustainability*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 1048, Feb. 2019.
- [15] M. Haddoud, K. Onjewu, and N. Jones, “Mindfulness and goal implementation in early-stage entrepreneurship,” *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, vol. 13, 2020.
- [16] R. Eisenberger, R. Huntington, S. Hutchison, and D. Sowa, *ibid*. [Duplicate for clarity in multiple citation areas.]
- [17] J. N. Kurtessis et al., “Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory,” *Journal of Management*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1854–1884, 2017.
- [18] I. G. N. A. Alwiyasa, A. Wibowo, and A. Supriyadi, “Key to startup success in Indonesia: Analysing the influence of entrepreneurial culture and psychological capital,” 2024.

- [19] M. A. Sabekti, R. Fitriyani, and E. Supriyanto, “Pengaruh desain kurikulum dan kegiatan ekstrakurikuler terhadap pembentukan mindset kewirausahaan mahasiswa,” 2023.
- [20] K. C. Cox, B. A. Mueller, and S. E. Moss, “An integrated model of intentional entrepreneurial action,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1125–1147, 2012.
- [21] L.-Y. Wang and J.-H. Huang, “The relationship between internal locus of control and entrepreneurial intentions of college students: A chain mediation model,” *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 141–151, 2022.
- [22] R. Ananda and E. Noviani, “Internal locus of control and entrepreneurial self-efficacy among Indonesian university students,” *Journal of Entrepreneurship Development*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 55–66, 2024.
- [23] G. S. Bangsa and D. H. Wibowo, “Locus of control and psychological capital: The key to success for thriving entrepreneurs,” *Psikoborneo: Jurnal Ilmu Psikologi*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v12i3.15123>
- [24] A. Borchers and S. H. Park, “Understanding entrepreneurial mindset: A study of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, locus of control, and intent to start a business,” *Social Science Research Network*, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1638746>
- [25] A. Caputo, V. H. A. Nguyen, and S. Delladio, “Risk-taking, knowledge, and mindset: Unpacking the antecedents of entrepreneurial intention,” *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-024-01064-3>
- [26] A. Tabak, J. A. Siguaw, S. A. Walter, and D. Gulten, “Risk tolerance and innovativeness: The role of psychological capital,” *Journal of Management Research*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 12–25, 2010.
- [27] V. Geetha, C. K. Gomathy, and D. S. Manohar, “Developing an entrepreneurial mindset,” *Indian Scientific Journal of Research in Engineering and Management*, vol. 3, no. 9, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsrem37498>
- [28] R. Charoensap-Kelly, S. Wayne, K. Wang, and L. Tao, “Cultural values and entrepreneurial intentions: A comparative study,” *Asian Business & Management*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 134–152, 2020.
- [29] T. T. Nguyen, D. V. Tran, and M. T. Nguyen, “Cultural dimensions and entrepreneurial behavior: Evidence from Vietnam,” *Journal of Asian Economics*, vol. 62, pp. 101138, 2019.
- [30] X. Y. Duan, “Entrepreneurial motivation research: Conceptual structure and future directions,” 2012.
- [31] E. Wiratmanto and R. Widiasih, “Locus of control, risk tolerance, and entrepreneurial intention among Indonesian millennials,” *Indonesian Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 122–130, 2019.

- [32] A. Yani, “The impact of psychological factors in decision-making to entrepreneurial intentions,” 2024.
- [33] L. Shaver and J. Commarmond, “Psychological drivers of startup intention: A psychological trait perspective,” *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 904–927, 2020.
- [34] S. Hartmann, J. Backmann, A. Newman, K. M. Brykman, and R. J. Pidduck, “Psychological resilience of entrepreneurs: A review and agenda for future research,” *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 527–560, 2022.
- [35] C. Naumann, “Entrepreneurial mindset: A synthetic literature review,” *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 149–172, 2017.
- [36] T. K. Cao and H. M. Ngo, “Linking entrepreneurial intentions and mindset models: A case from Vietnam,” 2019.
- [37] P. Robinson and M. Gough, “The right stuff? Defining and influencing the entrepreneurial mindset,” 2020.
- [38] V. S. Kushwaha and P. Singh, “The entrepreneurial mind: Unraveling psychological drivers behind start-up intention,” 2023.
- [39] M. Obschonka, “The quest for the entrepreneurial culture: Psychological big data in entrepreneurship research,” *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 18, pp. 69–74, 2017.