

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: James, Albert, Hadjielias, Elias, Guerrero, Maribel, Discua Cruz, Allan and Basco, Rodrigo (2021) Entrepreneurial families in business across generations, contexts and cultures. *Journal of Family Business Management*, 11 (4). pp. 355-367. ISSN 2043-6238

Published by: Emerald

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/jfbm-01-2020-0003> <<https://doi.org/10.1108/jfbm-01-2020-0003>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/42732/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



**Entrepreneurial families in business across generations,
contexts, and cultures**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Family Business Management</i>
Manuscript ID	JFBM-01-2020-0003
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	family, Family business, entrepreneurial families, Generational cohorts, culture, contexts

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Entrepreneurial families in business across generations, contexts, and cultures

Abstract

Purpose: This article is the editorial for the special issue on ‘Entrepreneurial Families in Business Across Generations, Contexts, and Cultures’. We aim to develop a road map that can help academics and practitioners navigate the findings of the articles contained in this special issue. We also suggest future lines of research around the topic of entrepreneurial families in business.

Design/methodology/approach: We develop a conceptual model for interpreting and understanding entrepreneurial families in business across contexts and time.

Findings: Our conceptual model highlights the importance of context and time when conducting research on entrepreneurial families in business.

Practical implications: The findings in this special issue will be of relevance for decision makers who tailor policies that embrace different economic and social actors, including entrepreneurial families.

Originality/value: This editorial and the articles that make up this special issue contribute to family business research by contextualising the phenomenon of entrepreneurial families in business. We propose a new holistic perspective to incorporate context and time in the study of entrepreneurial families that own, govern, and manage family firms over time.

Keywords: Family; Family Business; Entrepreneurial Families; Generational cohorts; Contexts; Cultures

1. Introduction

This Special Issue is about entrepreneurial families in business. These families lie at the heart of the body of knowledge that intersects the fields of family business and entrepreneurship (Discua Cruz et al., 2017; Discua Cruz and Basco, 2018). Entrepreneurial families in business¹ denotes the group of family members, often from different generations, who are actively involved in the business and behave entrepreneurially (Discua Cruz et al., 2017; Rosa et al., 2014). Family members perform activities together, share ideas, and act upon available information and resources based on their circumstances to engage in entrepreneurship (McMullen et al., 2008; Roscoe et al., 2013). This research stream is vital because entrepreneurial families across generations shape the way family firms become an essential component of the socio-economic landscape of towns, cities, and regions around the world (Basco and Bartkeviciute, 2016; Guerrero and Peña-Legazkue, 2013; Howorth et al., 2010; Seaman, 2015).

Our point of departure lies in recent conversations that signal a processual turn in entrepreneurship studies (Anderson et al., 2009; Shepherd, 2015) and highlight entrepreneurship as a contextually bounded phenomenon (Basco, 2017). This entails an increased interest to understand entrepreneurship not only as the collaborative process from an idea to a business or commercialisation, but also a practice that cannot be separated from context and time (Welter et al., 2016; Wiklund et al., 2011). While families in business have been researched at the nexus between entrepreneurship and family studies (Aldrich and Cliff, 2003; Heck et al., 2006; Olson et al., 2003; Williams et al., 2013), the family business literature has yet to sufficiently address the links between entrepreneurial families, context, and time (Discua Cruz and Basco, 2018).

¹ There are several terms that are used to refer to the phenomenon of 'family in business' such as entrepreneurial families, enterprising families, entrepreneurial households, or business families (Carter et al., 2017; Habbershon and Pistrui, 2002; Hamilton et al., 2017; Uhlaner, 2006). For a detailed discussion on family perspectives on entrepreneurship see Discua Cruz and Basco (2018)

1
2
3 To address the aforementioned research gap, our editorial and the articles in this special
4 issue focus on entrepreneurial families in business across contexts and time, aiming to facilitate
5 a reconceptualization of the role and position of the family within family business research.
6
7 We argue that it is necessary not only to investigate the family/business nexus but also to
8 contextualise this relationship. Thus, we propose a model that showcases the role of context
9 and time on entrepreneurial families in business. Such development is important as most family
10 business research has been contextless (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2020), or it has been framed
11 around theoretical perspectives that prevail in Western contexts—that is, the Western
12 perspective has dominated family business research. Context and time have been overlooked,
13 both as dimensions that set research boundaries and as parameters that establish how the
14 research phenomenon reacts and behaves in the presence of constraints and opportunities in
15 specific contextual and time settings.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 This editorial is structured as follows. First, we present a theoretical framework to facilitate
31 understanding of the phenomenon of entrepreneurial families in business. The aim of this
32 theoretical framework is to establish boundaries for the introduction of the articles published
33 in this special issue and to initiate an academic discussion in the family business field. Second,
34 we offer a review of the articles in this special issue, highlighting how these articles make
35 important contributions to family business research. Third, we focus on future lines of research
36 in an attempt to answer the question: *‘Where can we go from here in research on
37 entrepreneurial families in business?’* Finally, we close our special issue by highlighting the
38 contributions of this editorial article.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **2. The phenomenon of entrepreneurial families in business across context and time**

55 *How do family business scholars interpret the phenomenon of the ‘entrepreneurial family’ in*
56 *family business research?* This question is fundamental to approaching and understanding
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 family firms. Figure 1 attempts to capture the complexity of studying family firms from an
4 entrepreneurial family perspective by focusing on the role of context and time.
5
6

7
8 --- Insert Figure 1 around here ---
9

10 Figure 1 portrays the relationship between the family and business systems and the
11 multiple contexts in which family firms are embedded. Family business research has mainly
12 focused on the family/business interaction (the horizontal link between the family and the
13 family firm in Figure 1). In this sense, there have been two primary lenses through which to
14 approach phenomena within the family business field.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 First, the classical lens understands family as an institution that is parallel to and
22 overlaps with the firm. This lens interprets family and business as two interacting systems
23 where family members assume different roles in both systems. Most family business research,
24 directly or indirectly, uses assumes this perspective to interpret the specificities of family firms
25 (de Araujo et al., 2016), highlight the differences between family firms and non-family firms
26 (Mazzi, 2011), and classify different types of family firms (Westhead and Howorth, 2007).
27 This line of research contributed to the establishment of the family firm as a separate type of
28 firm which dominates the economic and social landscape in developed and developing
29 economies (Gupta and Levenburg, 2010). The second lens interprets the family as a set of
30 dimensions that manifest themselves within the boundaries of family firms in order to
31 recognise when a firm is a family firm and to what degree (Frank et al., 2017). We can
32 categorise these two research streams as the demographic and behavioural approaches (Basco,
33 2013), alternative ways to identify family involvement within firms and capture the family
34 effect on firms' behaviours and performance.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Second, in this editorial, context moves beyond the phenomenon itself (entrepreneurial
54 families in business), and the demarcation between context and the phenomenon comprises
55 both physical and cognitive considerations (Basco, 2015). Context has been traditionally
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 represented by formal and informal environmental conditions (North, 1990; Scott, 1995) that
4
5 shape the phenomenon of entrepreneurial families in business. However, one recent work
6
7 suggests that there are multiple and overlapping embedded contexts (Basco, 2017) that may
8
9 influence the practice of entrepreneurship among families in business. Furthermore, contexts
10
11 such as industrial districts (Johannisson et al., 2007), entrepreneurial environments (Guerrero
12
13 et al., 2013; Guerrero and Peña-Legazkue, 2013, 2019; Guerrero and Urbano, 2017), family
14
15 clans/diasporas (Elo et al., 2018), as well as spatial and temporal aspects merit close attention
16
17 (Guerrero and Urbano, 2017). Therefore, we can infer that context not only represents the
18
19 boundaries where the phenomenon exists (Cappelli and Scherer, 1991) but also that it is a
20
21 dimension that may or may not constrain the phenomenon itself.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Figure 1 illustrates three contextual levels on which entrepreneurial families in business
28
29 can be studied: the family as a context (micro-context), the meso-context, and the macro-
30
31 context. In the first level, family is taken as a social context, the characteristics of which vary
32
33 within the formal and informal environmental conditions of the meso and macro environments,
34
35 change over time, and yet remain recognisable as being related to the family (Bourdieu, 1996;
36
37 Cigoli and Scabini, 2006). Within the extant family business literature, there have been several
38
39 attempts to recognise the family as a standalone context for studying firm entrepreneurial
40
41 behaviours such as transgenerational entrepreneurship (Suess-Reyes, 2017), entrepreneurial
42
43 legacy (Jaskiewicz et al., 2015), new venture creation (Kirkwood, 2012), and entrepreneurial
44
45 households (Alsos et al., 2014). Research has also recognised that not all families are the same.
46
47 There are family specificities linked to family business structure, as well as psychosocial and
48
49 transactional functions (Stangej and Basco, 2017), that play a role in a family business's
50
51 entrepreneurial behaviour.
52
53
54
55

56
57 In the second level, a meso-context has been explored to a lesser extent (Stough et al.,
58
59 2015). However, new research efforts are unveiling the importance of regional and urban/rural
60

1
2
3 contexts for family firms in general (Baù et al., 2019; Karlsson, 2018), for family engagement
4 in collective entrepreneurial activities (Hadjielias and Poutziouris, 2015), and for the particular
5 case of family-run start-ups (Bird and Wennberg, 2014), as well as the importance of industrial
6 districts (Cucculelli and Storai, 2015). The third level, the macro-context, identifies economic,
7 social, and cultural patterns that condition the economic activities of a family in business
8 across generations (Gupta and Levenburg, 2010; Levenburg and Gupta, 2012), such as
9 transgenerational entrepreneurship (Basco et al., 2018).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Finally, the temporal element of context refers to the evolution of the studied
20 phenomenon in relation to time. While time is a dimension that affects individual behaviours,
21 it is also a dimension that changes the environmental conditions in which the often taken for
22 granted notion of family is constantly reinvented (Bourdieu, 1996). Time is also a dimension
23 that has ‘unnaturally separated’ family from business (Aldrich and Cliff, 2003). Time has been
24 examined as a linear and regular pattern, which is irreversible, and subject to the meaning that
25 cultures associate with it (Ancona et al., 2001). The most common interpretation of time comes
26 from the generational movement of family across time (Stangej and Basco, 2017). However,
27 other time-related perspectives have emerged, such as the view that families deploy a temporal
28 repertoire in the praxis of family business (Drakopoulou Dodd et al., 2013) and the view that
29 family control can be sustained over time through relevant motivations (Tucker, 2011) and
30 tailored managerial controls (Botero et al., 2015).

3. Articles in this special issue

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 We received 18 submissions in response to the call for papers on ‘entrepreneurial families in
52 business across generations, contexts, and cultures’. Six articles (see Table 1) went through
53 multiple rounds of blind reviews designed by the guest editors to reach the standard of quality
54 and fit of this special issue.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The first article that opens this special issue is titled ‘Family Entrepreneurial Resilience:
4 An Intergenerational Learning Approach’ (Zehrer and Leiß, 2020). Applying an action
5 research approach using a single case study and implementing the Double ABC-X model as
6 an analytical framework, this article discusses the process that makes entrepreneurial families
7 in business resilient. This article introduces a sequential process across three phases—*the pre-*
8 *crisis phase, the crisis phase, and the post-crisis phase*—where the pile-up of demands,
9 adaptative resources, and perceptions play an important role in family adaptation and
10 resilience. This article advances the debate about family firm survival by focusing on the
11 context of the family as a source of resilience. It also opens new lines of research by
12 considering the family in business as a source of resilience in different industries, regions,
13 cultures, and at different generational times.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The second article is titled ‘Family Equity as a Transgenerational Mechanism for
29 Entrepreneurial Families’ (Bierl and Kammerlander, 2019). This conceptual article shifts our
30 understanding of family equity from its mere economic role to a tool for entrepreneurial
31 families to create value across generations. The authors present a three-phase model of family
32 equity creation, which offers implications for research on transgenerational value creation as
33 well as practical implications for family members and practitioners seeking to align family
34 members’ expectations. This conceptual model opens new research possibilities to empirically
35 test and refine the model of family equity creation and to study the extent to which this model
36 could be used as an instrument to preserve the entrepreneurial spirit across generations or the
37 economic behaviour of a rentier family.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The third article, titled ‘No Hard Feelings? Non-Succeeding Siblings and their
51 Perception of Justice in Family Firms’ (Matser et al., 2020), delves into the family perception
52 of justice from the perspective of non-succeeding siblings. The authors expand the current
53 family business succession conversation from the typical successor-incumbent relationship to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 family members who are not directly implicated in the succession process, yet are deeply
4 affected by it. Focusing on family justice perception and developing a conceptual model with
5 theoretical and practical implications, this article is contextualised in relation to Dutch family
6 farms. This article opens the theoretical debate on the relationship between organisation justice
7 and family justice. This relationship is hardly explored in the literature, but it has a profound
8 implication for family business theory development and offers practical solutions for keeping
9 the family united after succession.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 The fourth article, titled ‘Migrant Family Entrepreneurship—Mixed and Multiple
20 embeddedness of Transgenerational Turkish Family Entrepreneurs in Berlin’ (Selcuk and
21 Suwala, 2020), explores the contextual conditions that Turkish family entrepreneurs
22 experience during the succession process through mixed and multiple embeddedness
23 perspectives. This article looks at the migrant family in business phenomenon to highlight not
24 only the generational gap but also the cultural gap between migrant family generations and
25 local-born family generations. While this article opens the conversation about migrant families
26 and their integration through businesses, it also creates possibilities for the replication of the
27 work beyond the German national context. In line with this article, the fifth article, titled
28 ‘Embeddedness and Entrepreneurial Traditions: Entrepreneurship and Bukharian Jews in
29 Diaspora’ (Elo and Dana, 2020), explores entrepreneurial tradition in a diasporic context. This
30 article shows that diasporic family businesses are the results of culture and tradition that move
31 across geographical spaces. This article links three phenomena, which have historically been
32 investigated separately—diaspora, family firms, and immigration—creating new research
33 avenues in the family business field.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Finally, the sixth article that closes this special issue, titled ‘The Adoption of
54 Governance Mechanisms in Family Businesses: An Institutional Lens’ (Parada et al., 2020),
55 focuses on the pattern that family firms adopt to introduce and implement business and family
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 governance structures. The article's findings showing that family firms first implement
4 business governance structures followed by family governance structures are justified by the
5 institutional pressure to implement such structures. Even though family firms can gain
6 legitimacy in their surroundings by implementing such structures, that fact that governance
7 structures are not perceived as being useful is one reason the authors consider governance
8 structures in family firms to be largely ceremonial. This article questions the validity of past
9 research on corporate governance in family business (such as research measuring the impact
10 of board demographics or board tasks on firm performance) because even though family firms
11 implement standardised and well-known practices, family firms do not believe that these
12 practices really have an impact on their firms, thereby limiting their implications for firm value
13 creation.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 --- Insert Table 1 around here ---
29

30 31 **4. Future lines of research**

32
33 Despite the new knowledge on entrepreneurial families in business offered in this special issue,
34 there are several future lines of research that need to be investigated. Doing so can help develop
35 theories at the nexus between family, context, and time. To explore future lines of research, we
36 draw on our theoretical framework (see Figure 1) to propose four main research streams
37 regarding entrepreneurial families in business.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 --- Insert figure 2 around here ---
46

47 First, the relationship between family and family business (a) can be divided into three
48 levels: individual, group/team, and system (family and business). Regarding the individual
49 level, research should move beyond the successor/incumbent relationship. Within the family,
50 family members who are not employed in the firm play an important role, but these actors have
51 been traditionally omitted from family business research. Focusing on intergenerational family
52 member interactions—that is, how rules, patterns, and expectations unfold and adapt as the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants' life courses change as part of these interactions—we can expand our knowledge
4 of families in business by adopting the proposed framework by Stangej and Basco (2017),
5 which offers three research perspectives: structural, psychological, and transactional.
6
7
8
9

10 The structural perspective focuses on individual birth order, position in the family, and
11 other structural characteristics such as single-parent family, stepfamily, joint family, unmarried
12 parents, and same-sex parents. These family structures, among others, can alter relationships
13 between family members, the level of connection with the firm, and the resources that family
14 members bring and create. Several research questions emerge from this perspective. How does
15 the position of family members in the family and firm system contribute to the mobilisation of
16 entrepreneurial resources from family members to the firm? How does the configuration of ties
17 between family members contribute to the mobilisation of entrepreneurial resources from
18 family members to the firm?
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The psychological perspective focuses on the roles of family members in their families
31 and family firms; the emotions, expectations, and needs that are associated with these roles;
32 and how they collectively contribute to the development of relationships and the transfer of
33 resources. This perspective also raises several research questions. How do individual family
34 members' emotions, expectations, and needs within the family and business systems influence
35 family relationships in the business? How do individual family members' emotions,
36 expectations, and needs within the family and business systems influence the practice of
37 entrepreneurship in the business? How do individual family members' emotions, expectations,
38 and needs within the family and business systems influence the mobilisation of entrepreneurial
39 resources from family members to the firm?
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Finally, the transactional perspective focuses on how families (as a group) develop their
55 emotional ties, share experiences, and link their expectations about the future. Several research
56 questions emerge from this perspective. How do shared understandings between family
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 members (e.g., shared expectations, shared identity, and shared beliefs) influence the
4 mobilisation of entrepreneurial resources from family members to the firm? How do shared
5 understandings between family members influence the practice of entrepreneurship in the
6 business? Answering such questions may reveal that the structural, psychosocial, and
7 transactional aspects acquire a unique meaning when they are interpreted in accordance with
8 the context and time.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Second, regarding the family as context (b), the multiple-embeddedness perspective
18 (Basco, 2017) could be used to unveil the complexity of context. The family layer is about the
19 family itself as a context. The family is not only the first permeable boundary where family
20 firms dwell, but it also represents the forces that constrain and expand the possibility of family
21 firms. In this sense, the family as a context can be interpreted in different ways to contextualise
22 family business research. On the one hand, the family can be understood as a situational
23 characteristic that embraces the family firm. This has been the most common approach to
24 contextualise the family firm within a family (Azmat and Fujimoto, 2016; Basco, 2019), but
25 more research is needed to better understand the way the firm's embeddedness in the family
26 influences the behaviours and actions of family members—both family members that are
27 working in the firm and those who are outside the firm.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Contextualising the firm within the family can provide new avenues to investigate family
44 firms. These new avenues may bring out temporal aspects, such as how the **family life** cycle
45 influences entrepreneurship by family members in the firm. They may also highlight the
46 cultural aspect of how traditional values and beliefs, legacy, and family history influence
47 entrepreneurship and relationships among family and non-family stakeholders—this can also
48 connect the socioemotional wealth view and entrepreneurial families more closely. On the
49 other hand, family as a situational strength that may intensify relationships, behaviours, and
50 reactions in family firms. A situational strength is important because it can help determine
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 family firm heterogeneity based on the type of family behind the firm. Several research
4 questions emerge from this perspective. What types of families are behind different types of
5 firms? How do families, beyond mere participation in the firm, shape and re-shape
6 family/business relationships and firm behaviour? How are particular reactions defined in
7 terms of risk aversion, firm strategy, and performance?
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Third, context refers to the entrepreneurial stimulus across generations. The family, in its
16 different facets, can mark the destiny of family firms in terms of birth, development, and
17 survival. Future research must focus on the embedded role that families play in new venture
18 creation, firm development and growth, and, of course, in firm sustainability across
19 generations. The meso-context layer (c) deals with the close physical territory where
20 individuals and institutions develop their relationships and the cognitive space where
21 individuals and society cultivate their understanding about the world around them. This layer
22 is less explored in family business studies, but it is extensively developed in family research
23 (LaRossa and Reitzes, 2004), and opens new research possibilities for discovering the
24 contextualising effect of families in business. Other research questions emerge from this
25 perspective. How do social and economic relationships, beyond the family realm, shape
26 families in business? How do economic and social relationships determine the family's status
27 as a wealth creator, wealth preserver, or wealth destroyer? How do family and non-family
28 members build their relationships with the firm over time? How do family firms contribute to
29 the configuration of entrepreneurial and innovative ecosystems? In line with the interpretation
30 of the space as being relational, several research questions also emerge when considering the
31 cognitive space. How do families' and family firms' cognitions interact and relate to multiple
32 societal cognitive spaces? How do family and firm cognitions shape societal cognitive spaces?
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

How do interactions and cognitions shape family identity within the firm?

1
2
3 The macro-context layer (d) is about the classical interpretation of the context in terms of
4 formal (i.e., the rule of law) and informal (i.e., culture) environmental conditions. Most studies
5 in this layer have focused on the influence of formal and informal context on the family in
6 business phenomenon (Khavul et al., 2009; Mollona, 2018). However, future work should also
7 consider that families and family firms are responsible for creating, maintaining, reflecting,
8 and projecting specific formal and informal institutional contexts. From this perspective, the
9 following research questions emerge. How do formal and informal environmental conditions
10 foster the creation and survival of the family business? Does the existence of families in
11 businesses frame specific types of capitalism (formal and informal systems)?
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Finally, the temporal dimension (e) involves changes across life-course stages, changes on
25 ownership/governance over time, and changes on formal/informal environmental conditions
26 across countries. It implies the adoption of an evolutionary perspective to understand the
27 drivers in the three aforementioned contexts. Several research questions emerge from this
28 perspective. How does time drive entrepreneurial families in business across generations,
29 contexts, and cultures? Which theoretical and methodological approaches are needed to
30 understand the role of time in entrepreneurial families in business across contexts?
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **5. Conclusions**

43
44 This editorial and the articles that compose this special issue represent a new paradigm to
45 approach entrepreneurial families in business by considering the importance of context and
46 time. Our special issue on 'entrepreneurial families in business across generations, contexts,
47 and cultures' makes several contributions to family business research and provides useful
48 implications to business families, practitioners, and business consultants.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 First, our editorial addresses the call made by Discua Cruz and Basco (2018) to integrate
57 the entrepreneurial perspective of the family into business by interpreting the family not only
58
59
60

1
2
3 as an actor influencing firm behaviour and performance but also as a context which becomes a
4 source of family firm heterogeneity. While most research conceptualises heterogeneity
5 drawing on configurations and typologies of common family firm characteristics (Neubaum et
6 al., 2019), focusing on the family as a context can allow for an understanding of family firm
7 heterogeneity considering the family behind the business—that is, the family as a source of
8 family firm heterogeneity.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Second, while family business research has intensively focused on the family/business
18 relationship, the general context in which the family firm is embedded as well as the time factor
19 have been largely overlooked. Therefore, our editorial vindicates not only the importance of
20 context (i.e., interpreting it based on its different layers) but also the relevance of time (i.e., in
21 its objective and subjective interpretations). In this sense, we interpret context not only as a
22 boundary where the phenomenon of study is immersed but also as a unified or multi-layered
23 dimension that constrains or expands the phenomenon itself. Additionally, we understand time
24 not only as a sequence of events, such as generational passage, but also as a path-dependent
25 notion where family history matters, as in the case of the diasporic family (Elo et al., 2018),
26 and a notion relative to economic activities. Much as time impacts business and family
27 business, notions about the concept of family and the associated norms also change over time
28 (Bourdieu, 1996; Cigoli and Scabini, 2006). Both context and time are essential for developing
29 theories that can help describe, analyse, and predict phenomena linked to the family in business.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Our editorial also provides important practical implications. First, it can guide families
48 in business about entrepreneurial dynamics carried out by members of the family. Informing
49 families of the need to consider the context and time can enable them to adapt their
50 entrepreneurial objectives and increase the chances for successful entrepreneurial outcomes.
51
52 Second, it can make families in business aware of the way entrepreneurship can become a
53 medium through which family and business dimensions can interact to contribute to the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sustainability of the broader contexts—such as regions, communities, and entrepreneurial
4 ecosystems—in which they are embedded. Finally, our special issue also contributes to policy
5 makers by helping them to better understand the dimensions of family, context, and time when
6 tailoring policy to encourage, promote, and support entrepreneurial actions in their local and
7 regional communities.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Aldrich, H.E. and Cliff, J.E. (2003), “The pervasive effects of family on entrepreneurship: toward a family embeddedness perspective”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 18 No. 5, pp. 573–596.
- Alsos, G.A., Carter, S. and Ljunggren, E. (2014), “Kinship and business: how entrepreneurial households facilitate business growth”, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Routledge, Vol. 26 No. 1–2, pp. 97–122.
- Ancona, D.G., Okhuysen, G.A. and Perlow, L.A. (2001), “Taking Time to Integrate Temporal Research”, *The Academy of Management Review*, Academy of Management, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 512–529.
- Anderson, R.C., Duru, A. and Reeb, D.M. (2009), “Founders, heirs, and corporate opacity in the United States”, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 92 No. 2, pp. 205–222.
- de Araujo, T.R.P.P., Bucher-Maluschke, J.S.N.F. and Pedroso, J.S. (2016), “Systemic Principles in the Study of Family Businesses”, *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 259–264.
- Azmat, F. and Fujimoto, Y. (2016), “Family embeddedness and entrepreneurship experience: a study of Indian migrant women entrepreneurs in Australia”, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Routledge, Vol. 28 No. 9–10, pp. 630–656.
- Basco, R. (2013), “The family’s effect on family firm performance: A model testing the demographic and essence approaches”, *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 42–66.
- Basco, R. (2015), “Family Business and Regional Development. A theoretical model of regional familiness”, *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 259–271.
- Basco, R. (2017), “Epilogue: Multiple embeddedness contexts for entrepreneurship”, in Ramírez Pasillas, M., Brundin, E. and Markowska, M. (Eds.), *Contextualizing*

- 1
2
3 *Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies and Developing Countries*, Edward Elgar
4 Publishing, pp. 329–336.
5
6
7 Basco, R. (2019), “What kind of firm do you owner-manage? An institutional logics
8 perspective of individuals’ reasons for becoming an entrepreneur”, *Journal of Family*
9
10 *Business Management*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 297–318.
11
12
13 Basco, R. and Bartkeviciute, I. (2016), “Is there any room form family business into
14 European Union 2020 Strategy? Family business and regional public policy.”, *Local*
15 *Economy*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 709–732.
16
17
18 Basco, R., Calabrò, A. and Campopiano, G. (2018), “Transgenerational entrepreneurship
19 around the world: Implications for family business research and practice”, *Journal of*
20 *Family Business Strategy*.
21
22
23 Baù, M., Chirico, F., Pittino, D., Backman, M. and Klaesson, J. (2019), “Roots to Grow :
24 Family Firms and Local Embeddedness in Rural and Urban Contexts”,
25
26 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 360–385.
27
28
29 Bierl, P. and Kammerlander, N. (2019), “Family equity as a transgenerational mechanism for
30 entrepreneurial families”, edited by H., K.N. *Journal of Family Business Management*, 1
31 January.
32
33
34 Bird, M. and Wennberg, K. (2014), “Regional influences on the prevalence of family versus
35 non-family start-ups”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 421–436.
36
37
38 Botero, I.C., Gomez Betancourt, G., Betancourt Ramirez, J.B. and Lopez Vergara, M.P.
39
40 (2015), “Family protocols as governance tools: Understanding why and how family
41 protocols are important in family firms”, *Journal of Family Business Management*, Vol.
42
43
44 5 No. 2, pp. 218–237.
45
46
47 Bourdieu, P. (1996), “On the family as a realized category”, *Theory Culture Society*, Vol. 13,
48
49
50 pp. 19–26.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cappelli, P. and Scherer, P.D. (1991), “The missing role of context in OB: The need for a
4 meso level approach”, in Cummings, L.L. and Staw, B.M. (Eds.), *Research in*
5
6 *Organizational Behavior*, JAI Press, Greenwich CT, pp. 55–110.
7
8
9
10 Carter, S., Kuhl, A., Marlow, S. and Mwaura, S. (2017), “Households as a Site of
11
12 Entrepreneurial Activity”, *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship*, Now
13
14 Publishers, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 81–190.
15
16
17 Cigoli, V. and Scabini, E. (2006), *Family Identity: Ties, Symbols, and Transitions*, Lawrence
18
19 Erlbaum Associates, Mahawah, New Jersey.
20
21
22 Cucculelli, M. and Storai, D. (2015), “Family firms and industrial districts. Evidence from
23
24 the Italian manufacturing industry”, *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 6 No. 4,
25
26 pp. 234–246.
27
28
29 Discua Cruz, A. and Basco, R. (2018), “A family perspective on Entrepreneurship”, in
30
31 Turcan R & Fraser, N. (Ed.), *A Handbook of Multidisciplinary Perspectives on*
32
33 *Entrepreneurship*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 147–175.
34
35
36 Discua Cruz, A., Hadjielias, E. and Howorth, C. (2017), “Family entrepreneurial teams”, in
37
38 Ben-hafaiedh, C. and Cooney, T. (Eds.), *Research Handbook on Entrepreneurial*
39
40 *Teams: Theory and Practice*, C. Ben-Haf., Edward Edgar, UK.
41
42
43 Drakopoulou Dodd, S., Anderson, A. and Jack, S. (2013), “Being in time and the family
44
45 owned firm”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 35–47.
46
47
48 Elo, M. and Dana, L.-P. (2020), “Embeddedness and entrepreneurial traditions:
49
50 entrepreneurship and Bukharian Jews in diaspora”, *Journal of Family Business*
51
52 *Management*, p. in this issue.
53
54
55 Elo, M., Sandberg, S., Servais, P., Basco, R., Cruz, A.D., Riddle, L. and Täube, F. (2018),
56
57 “Advancing the views on migrant and diaspora entrepreneurs in international
58
59 entrepreneurship”, *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 119–
60

1
2
3 133.
4

5 Frank, H., Kessler, A., Rusch, T., Suess-Reyes, J. and Weismeier-Sammer, D. (2017),
6

7 “Capturing the Familiness of Family Businesses: Development of the Family Influence
8 Familiness Scale (FIFS)”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, SAGE Publications
9 Inc, Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 709–742.
10
11
12
13

14 Gomez-Mejia, L.R., Basco, R., Müller, C. and Gonzalez, A.C. (2020), “Family Business and
15 Local Development in Iberoamerica”, *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, p. Online
16 first.
17
18
19

20 Guerrero, M. and Peña-Legazkue, I. (2013), “The effect of intrapreneurial experience on
21 corporate venturing: Evidence from developed economies”, *International
22 Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 397–416.
23
24
25
26

27 Guerrero, M. and Peña-Legazkue, I. (2019), “Renaissance after post-mortem: the choice of
28 accelerated repeat entrepreneurship”, *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 47–
29 65.
30
31
32
33

34 Guerrero, M., Peña-Legazkue, I., Marshall, A., Gras, G., Mira, I. and Coduras, A. (2013),
35 “Entrepreneurial activity and regional development: an introduction to this special
36 issue”, *Investigaciones Regionales*, Vol. 26, pp. 5–15.
37
38
39
40

41 Guerrero, M. and Urbano, D. (2017), “The impact of Triple Helix agents on entrepreneurial
42 innovations’ performance: An inside look at enterprises located in an emerging
43 economy”, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 119, pp. 294–309.
44
45
46
47

48 Gupta, V. and Levenburg, N. (2010), “A Thematic Analysis of Cultural Variations in Family
49 Businesses: The CASE Project”, *Family Business Review*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 155–169.
50
51
52

53 Habbershon, T.G. and Pistrui, J. (2002), “Enterprising Families Domain: Family-Influenced
54 Ownership Groups in Pursuit of Transgenerational Wealth”, *Family Business Review*,
55 Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 223–237.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hadjielias, E. and Poutziouris, P. (2015), “On the conditions for the cooperative relations
4 between family businesses: the role of trust”, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial*
5
6 *Behavior & Research*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Vol. 21 No. 6, pp. 867–897.
7
8
9
10 Hamilton, E., Discua Cruz, A. and Jack, S. (2017), “Re-framing the status of narrative in
11 family business research: Towards an understanding of families in business”, *Journal of*
12
13 *Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 3–12.
14
15
16
17 Heck, R., Danes, S., Fitzgerald, M.A., Haynes, G., Jasper, C., Schrank, H., Stafford, K., et al.
18
19 (2006), “The family’s dynamic role within family business entrepreneurship”, in
20
21 Poutziouris, P., Smyrnios, K. and Klein, S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Family*
22
23 *Business*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, pp. 80–124.
24
25
26 Howorth, C., Rose, M., Hamilton, E. and Westhead, P. (2010), “Family firm diversity and
27 development: An introduction”, *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 5,
28
29 pp. 437–451.
30
31
32
33 Jaskiewicz, P., Combs, J.G. and Rau, S.B. (2015), “Entrepreneurial legacy: Toward a theory
34 of how some family firms nurture transgenerational entrepreneurship”, *Journal of*
35
36 *Business Venturing*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 29–49.
37
38
39
40 Johannisson, B., Caffarena, L.C., Cruz, A.F.D., Epure, M., Pérez, E.H., Kapelko, M.,
41
42 Murdock, K., et al. (2007), “Interstanding the industrial district: contrasting conceptual
43 images as a road to insight”, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. 19 No. 6,
44
45 pp. 527–554.
46
47
48
49 Karlsson, J. (2018), “Does regional context matter for family firm employment growth?”,
50
51 *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 293–310.
52
53
54 Khavul, S., Bruton, G.D. and Wood, E. (2009), “Informal Family Business in Africa”,
55
56 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 33 No. 6, pp. 1219–1238.
57
58
59 Kirkwood, J. (2012), “Family Matters: Exploring the Role of Family in the New Venture
60

- 1
2
3 Creation Decision”, *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, Routledge, Vol. 25
4
5 No. 2, pp. 141–154.
6
7
8 LaRossa, R. and Reitzes, D. (2004), “Symbolic interactionism and family studies”, in Boss,
9
10 P., Doherty, W., LaRossa, R., Schumm, W. and Steinmetz, S. (Eds.), *Sourcebook of*
11
12 *Family Theories and Methods: A Conceptual Approach*, Springer, NYC, NY, pp. 135–
13
14 162.
15
16
17 Levenburg, N. and Gupta, V. (2012), “Cultures, ideologies and family businesses”, *Journal*
18
19 *of Family Business Management*, Emerald, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 57–75.
20
21
22 Matser, I., Veldhuisen, E. and Bouma, J. (2020), “No hard feelings? Non-succeeding siblings
23
24 and their perception of justice in family firms”, *Journal of Family Business*
25
26 *Management*, p. in this issue.
27
28
29 Mazzi, C. (2011), “Family business and financial performance: Current state of knowledge
30
31 and future research challenges”, *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp.
32
33 166–181.
34
35
36 McMullen, J.S., Bagby, D.R. and Palich, L.E. (2008), “Economic Freedom and the
37
38 Motivation to Engage in Entrepreneurial Action”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and*
39
40 *Practice*, Blackwell Publishing Inc, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 875–895.
41
42
43 Mollona, M. (2018), “Factory, Family and Neighbourhood: The Political Economy of
44
45 Informal Labour in Sheffield”, *The Anthropology of Organisations*, Routledge, pp. 151–
46
47 172.
48
49
50 Neubaum, D.O., Kammerlander, N. and Brigham, K.H. (2019), “Capturing Family Firm
51
52 Heterogeneity: How Taxonomies and Typologies Can Help the Field Move Forward”,
53
54 *Family Business Review*, SAGE Publications Inc, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 106–130.
55
56
57 North, D.C. (1990), *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, *The*
58
59 *Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions*, Cambridge.
60

- 1
2
3 Olson, P.D., Zuiker, V.S., Danes, S.M., Stafford, K., Heck, R.K.Z. and Duncan, K.A. (2003),
4 “The impact of the family and the business on family business sustainability”, *Journal of*
5
6 *Business Venturing*, Vol. 18 No. 5, pp. 639–666.
7
8
9
10 Parada, M.J., Gimeno, A., Samara, G. and Saris, W. (2020), “The adoption of governance
11
12 mechanisms in family businesses: An institutional lens”, *Journal of Family Business*
13
14 *Management*, p. in this issue.
15
16
17 Rosa, P., Howorth, C. and Discua Cruz, A. (2014), “Habitual and portfolio entrepreneurship
18
19 and the family in business”, in Melin, L., Nordqvist, M. and Sharma, P. (Eds.), *The*
20
21 *SAGE Handbook of Family Business*, SAGE., Sage, London, pp. 364–382.
22
23
24 Roscoe, P., Discua Cruz, A. and Howorth, C. (2013), “How does an old firm learn new
25
26 tricks? A material account of entrepreneurial opportunity”, *Business History*, Routledge,
27
28 Vol. 55 No. 1, pp. 53–72.
29
30
31 Scott, R.W. (1995), *Institutions and Organizations*, Sage Publications Sage CA: Thousand
32
33 Oaks, CA.
34
35
36 Seaman, C. (2015), “Creating space for the business family: Networks, social capital &
37
38 family businesses in rural development”, *Journal of Family Business Management*, Vol.
39
40 5 No. 2, pp. 182–191.
41
42
43 Selcuk, G. and Suwala, L. (2020), “Migrant family entrepreneurship—mixed and multiple
44
45 embeddedness of transgenerational Turkish family entrepreneurs in Berlin”, *Journal of*
46
47 *Family Business Management*, p. in this issue.
48
49
50 Shepherd, D. (2015), “Party On! A call for entrepreneurship research that is more interactive,
51
52 activity based, cognitively hot, compassionate, and prosocial”, *Journal of Business*
53
54 *Venturing*, Vol. 30, pp. 489–507.
55
56
57 Stangej, O. and Basco, R. (2017), “The Entrepreneurial Role of Families in Transitional
58
59 Economies”, in Sauka, A. and Chepurenko, A. (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship in Transition*
60

1
2
3 *Economies. Diversity, Trends, and Perspective*, Springer, pp. 345–365.

4
5
6 Stough, R., Welter, F., Block, J., Wennberg, K. and Basco, R. (2015), “Family business and
7 regional science: ‘Bridging the gap’”, *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 6 No. 4,
8 pp. 208–218.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Suess-Reyes, J. (2017), “Understanding the transgenerational orientation of family
businesses: the role of family governance and business family identity”, *Journal of
Business Economics*, Vol. 87 No. 6, pp. 749–777.

Tucker, J. (2011), “Keeping the business in the family and the family in business: ‘What is
the legacy?’”, *Journal of Family Business Management*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 65–73.

Uhlaner, L.M. (2006), “Business family as a team: underlying force for sustained competitive
advantage”, in Poutziouris, P., Smyrniotis, K. and Klein, S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research
on Family Business*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, pp. 125–144.

Welter, F., Baker, T., Audretsch, D.B. and Gartner, W.B. (2016), “Everyday
Entrepreneurship—A Call for Entrepreneurship Research to Embrace Entrepreneurial
Diversity”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, SAGE Publications Inc, Vol. 41 No.
3, pp. 311–321.

Westhead, P. and Howorth, C. (2007), “Types’ of private family firms: An exploratory
conceptual and empirical analysis”, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol.
19 No. 5, pp. 405–431.

Wiklund, J., Davidsson, P., Audretsch, D.B. and Karlsson, C. (2011), “The Future of
Entrepreneurship Research”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp.
1–9.

Williams, D.W., Zorn, M.L., Russell Crook, T. and Combs, J.G. (2013), “Passing the Torch:
Factors Influencing Transgenerational Intent in Family Firms”, *Family Relations*, Vol.
62 No. 3, pp. 415–428.

1
2
3 Zehrer, A. and Leiß, G. (2020), “Family entrepreneurial resilience – an intergenerational
4 learning approach”, *Journal of Family Business Management*, Vol. in this is.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Articles in this Special Issue

Authors	Main research question	Method	Key findings	Future lines of research
Zehrer and Leiß (Zehrer and Leiß, 2020)	How is resilience developed through intergenerational learning during family leadership succession in business?	Qualitative method (action research case study methodology)	The power of the narrative to reflect past events and project future events seems to be the point where families start building resilience.	How do families build resilience in different contexts and time periods? How does the multi-layered interpretation of context affect resilient families?
Bierl & Kammerlander (Bierl and Kammerlander, 2019)	How does family equity emerge and what are its sources? How do entrepreneurial families utilise family equity to nurture transgenerational entrepreneurship?	Literature review and conceptual model	The family equity creation model is formed by three consecutive phases (harvesting, institutionalisation, and reinvestment), and it can be a tool for transgenerational entrepreneurship.	Can the family equity creation model be applied to different contexts? How does it change across generations?
(Matser et al., 2020)	How do non-succeeding siblings perceive justice with regard to family firm succession?	Qualitative method (case study methodology)	A conceptual model to evaluate the perceived fairness of family succession by non-successors.	How can the model of perceived fairness be adjusted to other sectors and cultural contexts?
(Selcuk and Suwala, 2020)	How do contextual conditions affect Turkish family entrepreneurs during the succession process?	Qualitative method (case study methodology)	The article introduces two different layers of context—mixed and multiple embeddedness—to better address the complexity of contextual features within migrant family entrepreneurs in succession.	Can the mixed and multiple embeddedness model be applied to different family firms beyond migrant family firms?
(Elo and Dana, 2020)	How do entrepreneurial traditions evolve in diasporic families?	Qualitative method (case study methodology)	This article shows that social ties and diaspora embeddedness create dynamism, fostering entrepreneurial identity as part of the Bukharian culture and as a preferred career option in the context of the Bukharian Jewish diaspora.	Are all diasporas conducive to fostering entrepreneurial behaviour? How do different types of diasporas address the challenge of family in business across geographical borders?
(Parada et al., 2020)	How are governance structures adopted and developed in family firms? Also, once adopted, how do family businesses perceive	Quantitative method (Mokken Scale Analysis)	Family businesses follow a specific process to develop governance structures and, in most cases,	When and how do these ceremonial governance structures become useful tools for managing the family/business

	these governance structures?		ceremonial governance structures.	relationship and provide competitive advantages to family firms?
--	------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1: The role of context and time on entrepreneurial families in business




Figure 2: Model of the role of context and time on entrepreneurial families in business

