
Editorial

Pramodita Sharma

Grossman School of Business,
The University of Vermont,
Burlington, VT 05405, USA
Email: psharma@bsad.uvm.edu

Bart J. Debicki*

Department of Management,
College of Business and Economics,
Towson University,
8000 York Road,
Towson, MD 21252, USA
Email: bdebicki@towson.edu
*Corresponding author

Alexandra Dawson

Department of Management,
John Molson School of Business,
Concordia University,
1450 Guy St.,
Montreal, Quebec H3H 0A1, Canada
Email: alexandra.dawson@concordia.ca

Franz W. Kellermanns

Department of Management,
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte,
9201 University City Blvd,
Charlotte, NC 28223-0001, USA

and

WHU (Otto Beisheim School of Management),
Institute of Family Business,
Burgplatz 2,
56179 Vallendar, Germany
Email: kellermanns@uncc.edu

Biographical notes: Pramodita Sharma is a Professor and the Daniel Clark Sanders Chair in Family Business at the Grossman School of Business, University of Vermont. A visiting Professor at the Kellogg School of Management's Center for Family Enterprises, she serves as the Editor of *Family Business Review*.

Bart J. Debicki is an Assistant Professor of Management in the College of Business and Economics at Towson University, Maryland. He received his PhD from Mississippi State University. His research has appeared in journals such as *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, *Family Business Review*, *Journal of Management History*, *Journal of Family Business Strategy* and *International Journal of Management Education*. He is the Associate Editor of the *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development* and serves on the Review Board of *Family Business Review*.

Alexandra Dawson is an Associate Professor of Management at Concordia University's John Molson School of Business. She is the Director of the National Bank Initiative in Entrepreneurship and Family Business and of the Concordia Small Business Consulting Bureau. Alexandra has a PhD in Management and Business Administration from Bocconi University in Milan, Italy. Her main research areas are family business, entrepreneurship and private equity.

Franz W. Kellermanns is the Addison H. & Gertrude C. Reese Endowed Chair in International Business and Professor of Management in the Belk College of Business at the University of North Carolina - Charlotte. He holds a joint appointment with the Center for Family Business at the WHU-Otto Beisheim School of Management (Germany). He received his PhD from the University of Connecticut. He is an Editor of *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*.

Family enterprises are business organisations in which the controlling family can exert significant influence on the goals pursued, strategies and behaviours adopted, and in turn, the performance of these firms. While the election of Donald Trump - a third-generation member of the Trump family business - as the 45th president of the USA has brought family enterprises to the centre stage of American (and perhaps global) conversations, the dominance of these enterprises around the world has been documented since the 1990s (Shleifer et al., 1999; Shanker and Astrachan, 1996). In a special section of the *Economist* focused on family enterprises, Wooldrige (2015) noted that this dominance is likely to continue as “family firms will remain an important feature of global capitalism for the foreseeable future”.

Family firms are not only ubiquitous, scholars are unified in their belief that these organisations are conceptually and qualitatively different from non-family firms in their aspired goals, behaviours and performance outcomes (Amit and Villalonga, 2014; Gómez-Mejía et al., 2011). It is not the size, industry, privately or publicly held ownership form, or location that lies at the root of the differences between family and non-family enterprises. Instead, it is the embeddedness of the family and the business systems, sometimes referred to as ‘familiness’ that leads to distinctive behaviours of these firms (Habbershon and Williams, 1999). These behaviours, largely dictated by the presence and salience of familial relationships and resulting intentions of the dominant family group in the business, are often considered an important defining factor with regard to family firms, alongside and beyond the mere extent of family involvement in ownership and management of the business. In fact, Chua, Chrisman and Sharma (1999) argue for the necessity to specifically incorporate behavioural aspects in the definition of family firms commonly used in theoretical and empirical research for the purposes of accurately distinguishing between family and non-family firms. As such, the in-depth look at the variety of family firm behavioural issues studied in the papers included in this special issue should serve to provide important theoretical and practical insights based on

the presented findings but also illustrate the magnitude of topics and phenomena yet to be understood and interpreted for the purposes of family firm research and practice.

Consequently, the aim of this special issue of the *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development* (IJMED) is to explore further our understanding of the behaviours of family firms resulting from the values shared by family members and thus the specific goals set forth by such enterprises, in order to recognise their potential impact on the future of the business world. In keeping with the ‘big-tent journal’ mission of IJMED, we sought to cast a wide net for papers focused on understanding the antecedents as well as consequences of behaviours in and of family enterprises. Previous research on behavioural issues in family firms has focused largely at the individual and to a much lesser extent at the group levels (special issue of *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2014). In an attempt to extend our understanding of the impact of family- and business-oriented financial and non-financial goals of family firms on observed behaviours and performance of family enterprises, we encouraged submissions at organisational level as well (Gómez-Mejía, Nuñez-Nickel and Gutierrez, 2001).

After a review of the papers submitted in response to our Call for Papers, six articles were selected for this special issue (Table 1). While four articles focus on the antecedents of firm-level behaviours, two articles aim to understand how parental or family member behaviours influence career intentions and firm performance, respectively. The two theory-building works (Jiang, Hayward and Morris, 2017; Binz-Astrachan et al., 2017) are complemented by three empirical theory-testing studies in large publicly listed (Memili et al., 2017; Zachary et al., 2017) and smaller family firms (Madden et al., 2017) as well as by a qualitative, interview-based investigation of success factors among family firms in a specific socio-economic context of an emerging economy (Kołodko et al., 2017). The diversity of topics, firm sizes and locations mirrors the nature of the family business studies at this stage of evolution of this literature (Evert et al., 2016; Yu et al., 2012). We are proud to present the collective work of 24 scholars in this special issue. Next, we share a brief overview of each article and some interesting future research possibilities around each topic. In our effort to enable interested IJMED readers to join the research pursuit focused on family businesses, we point to review articles and related research on topics covered in this issue.

Table 1 Behavioural issues in family enterprises: overview of the papers in this special issue

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Antecedents</i>	<i>Focal behaviour</i> (Individual/Group/Firm level)	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Empirical/Theoretical</i>
Jiang, Hayward and Morris		Parental behaviour (Group level)	Next-generations' career intentions	Theoretical
Madden, Madden, Strickling and Eddleston		Family members' perceptions and behaviours (Group level)	Firm performance	Empirical; 101 US family firms

Table 1 Behavioural issues in family enterprises: overview of the papers in this special issue (continued)

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Antecedents</i>	<i>Focal behaviour</i> (Individual/Group/Firm level)	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Empirical/Theoretical</i>
Zachary, Payne, Moore and Sexton	Environmental jolts	Entrepreneurial orientation behaviour (Firm level)		Empirical, S&P 500; 11-year time frame; 136 large publicly listed family businesses; 1,142 firm-year observations
Memili, Misra, Chrisman and Welsh	Family involvement in business	Internationalisation behaviour (Firm level)		Empirical, S&P 500; 386 large publicly listed family firms
Binz-Astrachan, Ferguson, Pieper and Astrachan	Goals of controlling family	Corporate citizenship behaviour (Firm level)		Theoretical
Kolodko, Weiss, Bitkowska, Kauf and Leszczewska	External environment	Success factors (Firm level)		Qualitative; interviews with 18 polish firm leaders

1 Group-level behaviours

1.1 Parental behaviour and next-generations career intentions

Since the 1990s, research by labour economists has observed that, as compared to others, children of business owners are two to three times more likely to become self-employed (Dunn and Holtz-Eakin, 2000; Hout and Rosen, 2000; Lentz and Laband, 1990). More recently, scholars have found a significant impact of parental preference in the career intentions of German adolescents growing up in family firms (Schröder, Schmitt-Rodermund and Arnaud, 2011). Opportunities for informal training and apprenticeship while growing up in family businesses have been said to be the causes of such observed transgenerational career choice mirroring behaviours. But, less than half of those with self-employed parents actually worked in their family member's business. Those who do reap performance advantages in their own entrepreneurial ventures (Fairlie and Robb, 2007), leading researchers to encourage parents who desire entrepreneurial career paths for their next-generation members within the existing family business or beyond, to communicate such intentions and provide experiential opportunities to their children (Schröder, Schmitt-Rodermund and Arnaud, 2011).

Why are some entrepreneurial parents more successful in encouraging their children towards similar career paths than others? Focusing on parental behaviours, Jiang, Hayward and Morris (2017) theorise that parents who foster secure attachments and

combine warmth, support and responsiveness, with discipline and high expectations, provide a stimulating environment that helps to build self-efficacy in launching entrepreneurial initiatives in existing family firms or creating new ventures. This article adds another layer of conceptual strength to the idea of behavioural consequences of generational shadow in family firms (Davis and Harveston, 1999). Furthermore, it reinforces how individual and parental efforts can support the development of *Entrepreneurs in Every Generation* (Cohen and Sharma, 2016).

This research considers the parental unit as being unidimensional. Scholarly efforts to refine this proposed theory might incorporate the effects of degree of alignment in the behaviour of a parental unit, the impact of different family structures and the stability or instability therein, on the career intentions and behaviours of next-generation members. In parallel, work must begin to gather empirical evidence to confirm or refine the proposed theories. Collaborative efforts by family scientists and family business scholars could be particularly beneficial to make rapid progress along these lines (Jennings, Bretkreuz and James, 2013). Considering the above, there might be value in organising a research conference that requires a mix of family scientists and management scholars to present and discuss relevant research articles.

1.2 Family member employees' behaviours and firm performance

A large proportion of behavioural research focused on employees tends to assume there is no familial relationship between the employees and owners of the firm. Hardly, any research is directed at understanding a distinctive, unique and important category of stakeholders - family member employees working in family firms but who are not (yet) the key decision makers of the firm and may or may not (yet) hold any ownership in the firm. However, the longevity of careers of family and non-family members in family firms is well established (Miller and Le Breton-Miller, 2005). In addition, due to their kinship with the controlling decision makers, they are in highly visible roles, regardless of their current position in the organisational structure. How might the concepts of distributive justice and participative management apply to these individuals? How might firm performance be influenced by their perceptions and behaviours? Madden et al. (2017) are narrow on these questions drawing from the social exchange and psychological contracting literatures and testing their theoretical model with data from 101 family firms in USA. Results point to the important role of perceptions of participative decision-making and distributive justice. Those who perceive high levels of both exhibit organisational citizenship extra-role behaviours, going above and beyond expectations, to contribute to the performance of the firm. In turn, these behaviours by family members encourage other employees to devote efforts leading to a positive workplace and high firm performance.

This article leads to several avenues for future theory-building and -testing works directed at this unique and important stakeholder group - family member employees. What factors may influence some family member employees to contribute more to their family enterprises than others? Research on varied motives of next-generation members to join their family firms has shed some light on this topic. Those whose career interests and identity align strongly with opportunities in the family firm tend to engage in discretionary activities beyond their job descriptions in order to contribute to firm performance. Surprisingly, those individuals who are guided by obligation towards the family tend to exhibit transformational leadership behaviours (Dawson et al., 2015).

Research points out that family enterprises can be the best or the worst of venues for employees to work in depending on whether the constructive or destructive aspects of inter- and intra-generational relationships among family members are dominant (Eddleston and Kellermanns, 2007). While initial efforts to understand factors underlying such behaviours are under way, review articles on conflict, succession, trust and identity, to name just a few, call for so much more important work that awaits attention (McKee et al., 2014; Whetten, Foreman and Dyer, 2014).

2 Firm-level behaviours

At the firm level, family business researchers have devoted significant scholarly efforts to topics such as succession and governance that have been reviewed by Daspit et al. (2016) and Madison et al. (2016), respectively. More recently, focus has turned to entrepreneurial and international strategies and behaviours of the firm (Goel and Jones, 2016; Feliu and Botero, 2016). Interest in social issues related to family firm behaviours is gathering momentum and provides remarkable opportunities for scholars (Van Gils et al., 2014). This literature has also been mindful of the statistic that family firms dominate not only in Western regions of the world but even more profoundly in Eastern and emerging economies. Efforts to understand the unique challenges and opportunities in such regions continue. Examples include a special issue of *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* (2013) and research on Polish and Romanian family firms (Kowalewski, Talavera and Stetsyuk, 2010; McKibbin and Pistrui, 1997). The articles featured in this section reflect this diversity to some extent. Two empirical studies that focus on entrepreneurial orientation and internationalisation use S&P 500 data. The third is a conceptual study focused on building theory related to the corporate citizenship behaviours of family firms; whilst the last sheds light on the most accurate ways for family firms to respond to the unique challenges and opportunities in the relatively young free-market economy of Poland.

2.1 *Entrepreneurial orientation and environmental jolts*

An entrepreneurially oriented firm takes risks in pursuit of innovations in a proactive attempt to pre-empt competitors. Miller (1983) proposed three dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation (EO) - innovativeness, proactiveness and risk-taking. The construct of EO has received a lot of research attention in the entrepreneurship literature (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). While EO was originally conceptualised as a static concept, more recently some insights have come to fore when considering EO over time. Research on long-lived family firms has revealed that at a point in time, a firm may vary in its performance on the internal, versus external, focus of each dimension. For example, a firm may be highly innovative in its externally facing offerings such as products, services or markets, but not in its inwardly focused systems and processes, or vice versa (Zellweger and Sieger, 2012). Moreover, at any point in time, a firm's focus on each dimension may vary. Such findings encouraged calls to incorporate time, context and environment in family business research (Sharma, Salvato and Reay, 2014).

Zachary et al. (2017) provide an excellent contribution to this line of research, as they focus on a sample of S&P 500 in order to understand how environmental jolts, such as the economic and financial crises of 2007–2008, change the EO in these firms. The

findings indicate that the EO is indeed affected by such phenomena, albeit gradually and discontinuously. While EO was found to increase during environmentally stable times, it was recalibrated to more conservative levels during environmental jolts; and further, as the environment stabilised, it began its upward trajectory anew. The authors interpret this finding to indicate the important role of internal stability and the mindset of longevity, which help to institutionalise and reinforce the EO in family firms before, during and after environmental jolts.

The impact of environmental conditions beyond firm control has a well-established history in management research, mainly with respect to environmental munificence, dynamism and complexity (Dess and Beard, 1984; Amit and Schoemaker, 1993; Boyd, 1990). However, such studies traditionally focus on general environments and common factors that determine them, rather than investigating the effects of irregular and non-standard environmental phenomena which typically are a one-time occurrence, such as environmental jolts. Recent study by Smith (2016), for instance, focused on another environmental jolt caused by the city of London winning the bid to organise the 2012 summer Olympics, which forced several firms to relocate due to the construction of Olympic venues. Family and non-family firms considered in Smith's study varied in their interpretation and responses to the jolt. For non-family firms, an economic logic dominated the response, while the differences among family firms were based on the extent of ownership dispersion, place attachment and heritage longevity. Specifically, when a family firm's identity was strongly linked to a location and this linkage dated back to several generations, the emotional and behavioural responses were strong and could not be justified using only the economic logic. Concentrated ownership strengthened the intensity of such reactions. Smith (2016) uses data collected from 45 in-depth case interviews from five firms ranging in age from 10 to 107, whereas Zachary et al. (2017) demonstrate the use of a longitudinal approach with random coefficient growth modelling, as they analyse shareholder letters and accompanying business documents from 136 large publicly held family firms, over an 11-year time frame. It is, therefore, important and encouraging that researchers are beginning to incorporate time, context and alternative views of the environment in their research, and their usage of different methods in these studies opens vast arenas for future research.

2.2 Internationalisation and family involvement in business

Research on internationalisation strategies and behaviours in/of family firms has substantially intensified in recent years. Pukall and Calabrò (2014) provide a comprehensive review on this topic pointing to mixed findings regarding the core question of whether family involvement in business helps or hinders internationalisation. Memili et al. (2017) consider this question by separating the nature of family involvement in the business into two categories: family involvement in ownership and family involvement in management and governance. Drawing on the concepts of human asset specificity, risk aversion and opportunism from the transaction cost theory, and testing these ideas on the data from 386 S&P 500 family firms, these authors find differential impact of family ownership and management on internationalisation in publicly traded family firms. While there is an inverted U-shaped relationship between family ownership and internationalisation, a U-shaped relationship is found between family involvement in the board and management and internationalisation. That is, internationalisation is at its highest, when family ownership is moderate and family

involvement in management or governance is either low or high (as opposed to moderate levels). This finding indicates the necessity for more detailed consideration of the factors that affect the extent of internationalisation in family firms, beyond the traditionally linear considerations of the impact of family influence and other family business idiosyncrasies on internationalisation. As such, this study sheds additional light on why research results have been mixed in this regard and thus points to further crucial research avenues.

2.3 Goals and family firms' citizenship behaviour

Family firms have been found to be more attentive to protecting their reputation and engage more in internally focused pro-organisational and externally focused community building and environment protection behaviours. Binz-Astrachan et al. (2017) explore why some family firms engage more readily in corporate citizenship behaviours than others. Building on previous research on goal diversity (Kotlar and De Massis, 2013), the authors distinguish between family vs. business centred goals and financial vs. non-financial objectives. The authors theorise that the primacy of non-financial goals for the controlling family is likely to positively impact corporate citizenship behaviours in the family firm. Two important caveats are provided to the proposed theory. First, stability of family ownership is an important pre-condition of long-term family control; second, akin to the difference between possessing vs. exerting power, the controlling family may or may not have the ability (or willingness) to influence the goals that the family business pursues.

While the diversity of goals pursued by family firms has been long documented (Tagiuri and Davis, 1992), it is only recently that research is being directed to understand how differences in goal aspirations of individuals within a controlling family are reconciled through the bargaining processes and how defining moments, such as leadership transition, energise the vocalisation of such differences, triggering alliance-building processes to renegotiate the organisational goals to be pursued by family firms (Kotlar and De Massis, 2013).

Finally, while it is necessary to understand a spectrum of behavioural factors and their antecedents as well as performance-related consequences in family firms, mainstream research sometimes neglects (in its effort to discover and interpret higher level theoretical models that reflect the majority of the real phenomena) to follow through the necessary conditions for accurate and reliable theory creation. As such, researchers develop study designs and test their models on samples drawn from specific locations and settings, and consequently draw theoretical conclusions that claim to be generalisable and applicable to wider contexts. Where research and theory development often falls short is proper acknowledgement and analysis of the conditions and boundaries of the investigated relationships, beyond merely stating the typical limitations of a study. As indicated by Smith and Hitt (2005), a high-quality theory should go beyond identifying factors to be studied and explaining why and how they are related and thus describe in detail the conditions and boundaries within which the relationships are indeed valid.

Many studies mention common research limitations, such as the geographic or contextual setting of their samples on which the model was tested, and as a consequence call for testing their developed models in a variety of other settings. Few studies, however, set out to answer these calls and test previously developed and tested models in different contexts. As discussed by Reay and Whetten (2011) in their Family Business

Review editorial on what constitutes a theoretical contribution in family business, there is a difference between contributing to theory and applying theory. A valid contribution to theory should actually aim to improve it, either by demonstrating that it does not always work as expected (it is not entirely correct), or that it is entirely wrong (Reay and Whetten, 2011). While it is necessary to contribute to theory in such manner, the importance of applying current knowledge to a variety of settings and appropriately acknowledging the specific conditions that affect our ability of predicting outcomes should not be undermined. For example, it is necessary to understand the particular environmental conditions that may be different from typical contexts in which family firms are considered in research and that may thus contribute to success or prevent family firms from succeeding. The last paper in our special issue sets out to do just that - analyse the behaviours and other related factors contributing to the success of family firms with special consideration given to the specific socio-economic conditions that exist in the countries of the former Eastern Bloc, in particular the countries of that group that are newly accepted members of the European Union. The authors do so on the example of the relatively newly developing economy of Poland and base their conclusions on interviews with family businesses in that region.

2.4 Behaviours and success factors of family firms in specific contextual conditions

Kolodko et al. (2017) present the contextual realities of Poland as it builds its socio-economic and legal systems to establish itself as a free-market economy. The private enterprise in this country is largely founder-led with firms being 20 years old or younger. The authors' interviews with 18 entrepreneurial leaders reveal the importance of adaptability and flexibility to overcome the challenges of the relatively rapid changes in market conditions. The results of this study are reminiscent of earlier research pointing to the critical importance of flexibility to survive in the unstable economy of Argentina reported in the book titled: *Adaptation or Expiration in Family Firms: Organizational Flexibility in Emerging Economies* (Hatun, 2007). Along these lines, research to understand how entrepreneurial family businesses not only cope but thrive in uncertain economies is growing, attracting scholars from various disciplinary and contextual backgrounds (Nordqvist et al., 2011).

3 Conclusion

In conclusion, interest in family business research has increased substantially over the last three decades, from 111 peer-reviewed published articles on family business before 1970 to over 800 articles a year since 2010 (Payne, Pearson and Carr, 2017). Over 50 special issues on family business-related phenomena have appeared since 2003 (for a listing please see Short et al., 2016). As scholars from different disciplines discover the intellectually stimulating and practically relevant arena of family enterprise research, they find themselves simultaneously puzzled and excited at the opportunities it offers. For a new scholar - eager to explore whether his/her research interests can find a nurturing context in family enterprises - the news could not be better. Family business researchers have been exceptional in generating comprehensive reviews regularly to make sense of the ever-growing body of literature and point to opportunities awaiting scholarly

attention. Examples include: *Annotated Bibliography of Family Business Studies* (De Massis et al., 2012), the *SAGE Handbook of Family Business* (Melin, Nordqvist and Sharma, 2014) or *The Routledge Companion to Family Business* (Kellermanns and Hoy, 2017) with review chapters viewing the field from different disciplinary, theoretical, methodological and topical perspectives, special review and method-focused issues of *Family Business Review*, or the annual family firm's special issue in *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* to name just a few available resources to get started. We hope that you enjoy this special issue and that the research presented herein inspires you to further explore behavioural phenomena in family businesses.

References

- Amit, R. and Schoemaker, P.J. (1993) 'Strategic assets and organizational rent', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp.33–46.
- Amit, R. and Villalonga, B. (2014) 'Financial performance of family firms', in Melin, L., Nordqvist, M. and Sharma, P. (Eds.): *SAGE Handbook of Family Business*, Sage Publications, London, UK.
- Binz-Astrachan, C., Ferguson, K.E., Pieper, T.M. and Astrachan, J.H. (2017) 'Family business goals, corporate citizenship behavior and firm performance: disentangling the connections', *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.22–44.
- Boyd, B. (1990) 'Corporate linkages and organizational environment: a test of the resource dependence model', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 11, pp.419–430.
- Chua, J.H., Chrisman, J.J. and Sharma, P. (1999) 'Defining the family business by behavior', *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp.19–39.
- Cohen, A.R. and Sharma, P. (2016) *Entrepreneurs in Every Generation: How Successful Family Businesses Develop Their Next Leaders*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Daspit, J.J., Holt, D.T., Chrisman, J.J. and Long, R.G. (2016) 'Examining family firm succession from a social exchange perspective: a multiphase, multi-stakeholder review', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.44–64.
- Davis, P.S. and Harveston, P.D. (1999) 'In the founder's shadow: conflict in the family firm', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp.311–323.
- Dawson, A., Sharma, P., Irving, P.G., Marcus, J. and Chirico, F. (2015) 'Predictors of later generation family members' commitment to family enterprises', *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp.545–569.
- De Massis, A., Sharma, P., Chua, J. and Chrisman, J. (2012) *Family Business Studies: An Annotated Bibliography*, Edward Elgar Publishing Inc., Northampton, MA.
- Dess, G.D. and Beard, D.W. (1984) 'Dimensions of organizational task environments', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 29, pp.52–73.
- Dunn, T.A. and Holtz-Eakin, D.J. (2000) 'Financial capital, human capital, and the transition to self employment: evidence from intergenerational links', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp.282–305.
- Eddleston, K.A. and Kellermanns, F.W. (2007) 'Destructive and productive family relationships: a stewardship theory perspective', *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp.545–565.
- Evert, R.E., Martin, J.A., McLeod, M.S. and Payne, G.T. (2016) 'Empirics in family business research: progress, challenges, and the path ahead', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.17–43.
- Fairlie, R.W. and Robb, A. (2007) 'Families, human capital, and small business: evidence from the characteristics of business owners survey', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 60, No. 2, pp.225–245.
- Feliu, N. and Botero, I.C. (2016) 'Philanthropy in family enterprises: a review of literature', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.121–141.

- Goel, S. and Jones III, R.J. (2016) 'Entrepreneurial exploration and exploitation in family business: a systematic review and future directions', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.94–120.
- Gomez-Mejia, L.R., Cruz, C., Berrone, P. and De Castro, J. (2011) 'The bind that ties: socioemotional wealth preservation in family firms', *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.653–707.
- Gomez-Mejia, L.R., Nunez-Nickel, M. and Gutierrez, I. (2001) 'The role of family ties in agency contracts', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 1, pp.81–95.
- Habbershon, T.G. and Williams, M.L. (1999) 'A resource-based framework for assessing the strategic advantages of family firms', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp.1–25.
- Hatun, A. (2007) *Adaptation or Expiration in Family Firms: Organizational Flexibility in Emerging Economies*, Edward Elgar Publishers, Cheltenham, UK.
- Hout, M. and Rosen, H.S. (2000) 'Self-employment, family background, and race', *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp.670–92.
- Jennings, J.E., Breitkreuz, R.S. and James, A.E. (2013) 'When family members are also business owners: Is entrepreneurship good for families?', *Family Relations*, Vol. 62, No. 3, pp.472–489.
- Jiang, D., Hayward, S. and Morris, M.L. (2017) 'Raising entrepreneurs: can parenting style amplify entrepreneurial intentions and behavior?' *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.1–21.
- Kellermanns, F.W. and Hoy, F. (2017) *The Routledge Companion to Family Business*, Routledge, New York.
- Kołodko, K., Weiss, E., Bitkowska, A., Kauf, S. and Leszczewska, K. (2017) 'Success factors in Polish family businesses', *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.116–137.
- Kotlar, J. and De Massis, A. (2013) 'Goal setting in family firms: goal diversity, social interactions, and collective commitment to family-centered goals', *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 37, No. 6, pp.1263–1288.
- Kowalewski, O., Talavera, O. and Stetsyuk, I. (2010) 'Influence of family involvement in management and ownership on firm performance: evidence from Poland', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.45–59.
- Lentz, B. and Laband, D. (1990) 'Entrepreneurial success and occupational inheritance among proprietors', *Canadian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp.563–579.
- Lumpkin, G.T. and Dess, G.G. (1996) 'Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp.135–172.
- Madden, T., Madden, L., Strickling, J. and Eddleston, K. (2017) 'Psychological contract and social exchange in family firms', *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.97–115.
- Madison, K., Holt, D.T., Kellermanns, F.W. and Ranft, A.L. (2016) 'Viewing family firm behavior and governance through the lens of agency and stewardship theories', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.65–93.
- McKee, D., Madden, T.M., Kellermanns, F.W. and Eddleston, K.A. (2014) 'Conflicts in family firms: the good and the bad', in Melin, L., Nordqvist, M. and Sharma, P. (Eds.): *SAGE Handbook of Family Business*, Sage Publications, London, UK.
- McKibbin, P. and Pistrui, D. (1997) 'East meets West: innovative form of foreign trade finance between Italian family enterprises and emerging SMEs in Romania', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp.263–280.
- Melin, L., Nordqvist, M. and Sharma, P. (2014) *SAGE Handbook of Family Business*, SAGE Publications Ltd., Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Memili, E., Misra, K., Chrisman, J.J. and Welsh, D. (2017) 'Internationalization of publicly traded family firms: A transaction cost theory perspective and longitudinal analysis', *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.68–96.

- Miller, D. (1983) 'The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms', *Management Science*, Vol. 29, No. 7, pp.770–791.
- Miller, D. and Le Breton-Miller, I. (2005) *Managing for the Long Run: Lessons in Competitive Advantage from Great Family Businesses*, Harvard Business Press.
- Nordqvist, M., Marzano, G., Brenes, E.R., Jimenez, G. and Fonseca-Paredes, M. (2011) *Understanding Entrepreneurial Family Business in Uncertain Environments: Opportunities and Resources in Latin America*, Edward Elgar Publishers, Cheltenham, UK.
- Payne, T.G., Pearson, A.W. and Carr, J.C. (2017) 'Process and variance modeling: linking research questions to methods in family business research', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 30, No. 1.
- Pukall, T.J. and Calabro, A. (2014) 'The internationalization of family firms: a critical review and integrative model', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp.103–125.
- Reay, T. and Whetten, D.A. (2011) 'What constitutes a theoretical contribution in family business?' *Family Business Review*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp.105–110.
- Schröder, E., Schmitt-Rodermund, E. and Arnaud, N. (2011) 'Career choice intentions of adolescents with a family business background', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp.305–332.
- Shanker, M.C. and Astrachan, J.J. (1996) 'Myths and realities: family businesses' contribution to the us economy – a framework for assessing family business statistics', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp.107–123.
- Sharma, P., Salvato, C. and Reay, T. (2014) 'Temporal dimensions of family enterprise research', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp.10–19.
- Shleifer, A., La Porta, R. and Lopez-De-Silanes, F. (1999) 'Corporate ownership around the world', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 54, No. 2, pp.471–517.
- Short, J., Lumpkin, G.T., Pearson, A.W. and Sharma, P. (2016) 'Oh, the places we'll go: reviewing past, present, and future possibilities in family business research', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.11–16.
- Smith, C. (2016) 'Environment jolts: understanding how family firms respond and why', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp.401–423.
- Smith, K.G. and Hitt, M.A. (2005) *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Tagiuri, R. and Davis, J.A. (1992) 'On the goals of successful family companies', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.43–62.
- Van Gils, A., Dibrell, C., Neubaum, D.O. and Craig, J.B. (2014) 'Social issues in the family enterprise', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp.193–205.
- Whetten, D., Foreman, P. and Dyer Jr., G.W. (2014) 'Organizational identity and family business', in Melin, L., Nordqvist, M. and Sharma, P. (Eds.): *SAGE Handbook of Family Business*, Sage Publications, London, UK.
- Wiklund, J. and Shepherd, D. (2005) 'Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: a configurational approach', *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp.71–91.
- Woolridge, A. (2015, April 18) 'Special report: Family companies—To have and to hold', *Economist*, Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21648171-far-declining-family-firms-will-remain-important-feature-global-capitalism>.
- Yu, A., Lumpkin, G.T., Sorenson, R.L. and Brigham, K.H. (2012) 'The landscape of family business outcomes: a summary and numerical taxonomy of dependent variables', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 25, pp.33–57.
- Zachary, M., Payne, G.T., Moore, C. and Sexton, J. (2017) 'Time to recalibrate? Exploring entrepreneurial orientation of family business before, during, and after an environmental jolt', *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.45–67.
- Zellweger, T. and Sieger, P. (2012) 'Entrepreneurial orientation in long-lived family firms', *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp.67–84.