Guest editorial

Institutional influences on entrepreneurial behaviours in the family entrepreneurship context: towards an integrative framework

This third special issue of the *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research* is dedicated to examining institutional influences on the entrepreneurial behaviours of business families, family businesses, and family business groups. As the study of family entrepreneurship continues to expand and focus moves towards understanding heterogeneity among family firms, understanding the institutional context in which family firms exist - as well as the variation in entrepreneurial behaviours, families, firms and business groups – becomes increasingly important. This special issue builds on the first two special issues in this journal by showcasing these relevant issues.

The first special issue (Volume 10, Issue 1/2) initiates the discussion in this journal. Poutziouris *et al.* (2004), in their introductory commentary, underscore the contradictory forces associated with entrepreneurship in the family business: the survival rate is deteriorating despite such organisations possessing unique resources (e.g., familiness, family social capital). The inaugural special issue includes papers that contribute to knowledge at the interface of family and entrepreneurship, addressing questions related to the interaction between aspirations and business behaviours and outcomes, entrepreneurial processes alongside issues of family firm governance, as well as (entrepreneurial) strategy formation and (family) governance mechanisms.

The second special issue (Volume 16, Issue 5) focusses on risk and family entrepreneurship. In their guest editorial, Seaman *et al.* (2010) note that the variety of family business in economies around the world is rich and that further exploration of the similarities and differences of the contexts in which these family firms operate is needed to further knowledge of how family businesses and business families entrepreneurially engage across a variety of contexts. Specifically, much remains to be understood about how economic systems, legal systems and culture (i.e., institutional context) influence entrepreneurial behaviours of business families, family businesses and family business groups.

To this end, this special issue focusses on examining how institutional forces affect the entrepreneurial behaviours of business families, family businesses and groups of family businesses. The field of family entrepreneurship[1] is a relatively nascent area of study relative to the expanded understanding of the causes and consequences of entrepreneurial behaviours (Bettinelli *et al.*, 2014). In their work on family entrepreneurship, Bettinelli *et al.* (2014) demonstrate theoretically that at least three loci of entrepreneurial behaviours exist in the family entrepreneurship context – individuals, families and family businesses – and that these three loci exert reciprocal influences. Indeed, an individual's perceptions and subsequent actions are strongly influenced by patterns learned during childhood from their parents and members of their family of origin. Further, families, as constructed social units (i.e. family of origin, family of choice, blended families, etc.), influence their members and are influenced by their members. Finally, the family firm influences the family (e.g. the "enterpriseness" of the firm; see Frank *et al.*, 2019) as well as individuals comprising it (e.g. successor development or new member socialisation). Expanding the scope of research dedicated to outcomes of entrepreneurial behaviours beyond the realm of financial performance, research related to family entrepreneurship seeks to understand the emergence and influences of entrepreneurial behaviours on outcomes such as firm start-up, growth, diversification, CSR and sustainable development, philanthropy, and beyond (Bergamaschi and Randerson, 2016; Randerson *et al.*, 2016).

International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research
Vol. 26 No. 1, 2020
pp. 1-13

1355-2554
DOI 10.1108/IJEBR-01-2020-824

However, understanding the sources and consequences of entrepreneurial behaviours of the individual, family and family firm become more complex when contextual influences are considered (Randerson, Bettinelli, Fayolle and Anderson, 2015; Welter, 2011; Zahra and Wright, 2011). More specifically, causes and effects manifest differently across communities and countries (Seaman *et al.*, 2016), creating vast complexities in the configuration of institutional forces that affect the entrepreneurial behaviours of individuals, families, family firms and family business groups (Randerson, Bettinelli, Dossena and Fayolle, 2015).

Institutions and family entrepreneurship

Institutions can be defined broadly as "the rules of the game" (North, 1991, p. 98). According to Scott (2001, p. 48), institutions are "social structures that have attained a high degree of resilience [and are] composed of cultural-cognitive, normative, and regulative elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life". Regulative elements, based on rational choices and design, refer to those that are "more formalized, more explicit, more easily planned and strategically manipulated" (Scott, 2010, p. 6). Normative elements comprise those that relate to social embeddedness of behaviour; here actors are viewed as social persons who adhere to the guidelines dictated by their own identity. Internalised commitments and perceived expected responses of others to a behaviour are more important than clear rules, aligned incentives and surveillance. Finally, cultural-cognitive elements "provide the bedrock" (Scott, 2010, p. 7) of the first two, as well as being self-reinforcing. The latter are socially constructed symbolic representations that provide vital templates for framing individual perceptions and decisions that can be explicit and more or less superficial but can also pertain to deeply entrenched assumptions. These three elements co-exist, can have varying levels, affect each other and exert independent effects on social order.

Additionally, institutions are often examined as being either formal or informal (North, 1991). Formal institutions refer to formal frameworks of governments, whereas informal institutions refer to more latent, socially constructed influences (Bruton *et al.*, 2010; Javidan *et al.*, 2006; Stephan and Uhlaner, 2010). Informal institutions compensate for voids in formal institutions, and this variation in institutional voids and support (i.e. the institutional context) affects a number of factors. From a family business perspective, for example, structural and relational social capital are affected given the extent to which formal and informal institutions exist (e.g. Daspit and Long, 2014).

Scott (2010) also notes that although institutions exist at different levels, extant research has concentrated on higher levels, leaving lower levels of analysis largely unexamined. This author also highlights that the property approach, consisting in studying the structural forms or variations of a specific institutional form, has attracted much more attention than the process approach, consisting in studying institutional emergence and change (Table I).

Although institutions are noted to affect and be affected by entrepreneurial activity (Welter, 2011; Zahra and Wright, 2011), extant research adopts a dichotomous approach. According to the institutional void perspective (Dacin *et al.*, 2010; Estrin *et al.*, 2013), resource scarce environments are conducive to entrepreneurial behaviours given that individuals behave entrepreneurially to provide services or create infrastructures that the government lacks to provide. Conversely, the institutional support perspective posits that entrepreneurial activity flourishes in countries with more developed governments that support entrepreneurial behaviours (Korosec and Berman, 2006; Zahra and Wright, 2011).

Formal institutions such as national laws and regulations explain differences in the form of family businesses, succession options (Jaskiewicz *et al.*, 2016) and succession processes (Barrédy, 2016). The legal system of families leads to different forms of families and to different sets of constraints at the time of succession for a family in business. The definition of the rights and duties among family members leads to take into account the choice or the

		FORMAL ⟷ INFORMAL		
	Level	Regulative	Normative	Cognitive-cultural
Macro	Transnational	UN, NATO, Regional Trade Agreements	MNCs professional organisations, implicit codes of conduct of certain professions	"Global" culture: push towards sustainability, circular economy, international extension of family and/or family business/family business group
	National	Law and other codified or non-codified mandatory rules (e.g. precedent or jurisprudence)	Axiom associated with identifying as a member of the concerned nation	National culture (Hofstede)
Meso	Sub-national (region, field, community, extended family, family business, family business group, religion)	Laws (or rules of equivalent force), family contributions, family contracts, company statutes, articles of association	Community identity, precepts of religions, family identity ensuing from idiosyncratic heritage, industry codes of conduct	Culture each of these levels
Micro	Inter-personal, family	Family constitution, family law, family contract	Professional identity, birth, position among siblings, gender identity	Family culture

Table I. Family entrepreneurship and institutions: levels and constitutive elements

absence of a choice in the designation of the successor in terms of ownership. For instance, the Napoleon Civil Code leads to treat all the children successors equally, whereas the Common Law system leaves to the incumbent the entire choice of who will inherit from him/her. These situations have major consequences in terms of governance of the family business, as well as interactions between the formal rules of the game (the law) and the informal rules of the games, for example, family culture. The system of pyramids of holding companies, for instance, is much more developed in civil code countries in order to solve the problem of treating all the children the same at the time of succession. Therefore, a link that appears between the governance of the family of one part is driven by the law and the governance of the company that needs to take into account the consequences on the business of the family law constraints.

Family businesses are often viewed as being in tune with their immediate social environment and being integrated within networks in their local communities (Van Gils *et al.*, 2014; Seaman *et al.*, 2017). This acknowledgement of family business engagement with local communities exists in parallel with a variety of conceptual lenses that can be used in the exploration of such a context: from focussing on temporal and social dynamics of business roles and networks in their locale (Welter, 2011) to examining the belonging and meaning attributed to place (Anderson and Gaddefors, 2016). Recent attempts to explore the context of family business highlight the importance of social structure and social relationships. When the influence of the family is integrated with communities of value-driven and culturally embedded expectations (Vorley, 2007), numerous influences on business activity exist, and numerous effects are noticed at the contextual level as well (Jones and Ram, 2012).

Family business research, by focussing on how the family affects the business while assuming the family involved is a "traditional" nuclear family (Randerson, Bettinelli, Dossena and Fayolle, 2015), is westernised (Ramirez-Pasillas *et al.*, 2017) and vastly oversimplified.

The family is an institution in its own right (Bettinelli *et al.*, 2014) given that it meets the criteria to be considered such given the cognitive, regulative and normative domains (Scott, 2001, 2010) and the institutional pressures it exerts (e.g. DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).

In furtherance of the understanding related to institutional forces and the business family, family business and family business groups, this special issues consists of seven articles. Each of the articles is summarised below, and we encourage readers to refer to the full articles to review the details of each study.

Articles in this special issue

Family dynamics and gender perspective influencing copreneurship practices: a qualitative analysis in the Brazilian context. Franco and Piceti (2020), in their qualitative study of seven copreneurial couples based in the State of Rio Grande do Sul, chose the context of Brazil to study how the institutional factor culture – high in masculinity according to Hofstede (2001) and ensuing "traditional" family dynamics – influence copreneurial entrepreneurial practices. Indeed, in highly masculine cultures, individuals strongly prefer role differences between genders. There are four main contributions of this study. First, the authors find that the desire to fulfil a dream and previous work experience in the activity or industry of a spouse contributes to the founding of a copreneurial venture. Second, entrepreneurial processes within the venture are influenced by professionalisation (further education or training, continuous improvement of skills) and the separation of tasks within the couple. Third, firm development and couple harmony are mutually reinforcing through relational-based factors such as trust, communication, flexibility and common goals. Finally, the women had professional/entrepreneurial roles outside of the copreneurial venture, which reinforced the perceived competency of the women in the copreneurial venture.

This study confirms that in high masculinity cultures, copreneurial success and spousal harmony depend on clear role differences between the spouses and that despite equivalent educational levels, women needed to external professional role/activity outside of the copreneurial firm in order to be perceived as competent within the copreneurial organisation.

Keeping it in the family: exploring Igbo ethnic entrepreneurial behaviour in Nigeria. Iqwe *et al.* (2020) examine an understudied and fascinating context of the Igbo tribe in Nigeria. The authors leverage the institutional context of Nigeria and its country-level institutional voids to understand how the Igbo context (at the extended family and tribe institutional level) influences the entrepreneurial behaviours of its members. Through their analysis of unstructured interviews of 25 Igbo business owners and 25 Igbo community leaders, they develop a tiered theoretical model that suggests family cohesion, early childhood entrepreneurial learning and informal apprenticeships are antecedents to the development of informal institutional characteristics (individual learning and social learning, family and kindred action, and societal norms). These informal institutional characteristics foster, in turn, the development of entrepreneurial characteristics (e.g. individualism, risk-taking, autonomy and need for achievement), which then support entrepreneurial behaviours, leading to the creation of legitimate new ventures and also to informal, or even illegal, lucrative activities.

In addition to the thick description of the Igbo context, this study offers several unique contributions. It shows that Igbo businesses are organised in a family, kindred and kinship system, and that entrepreneurial learning starts very early at home. An informal tribe-based apprentice system supports further learning and practice of entrepreneurial behaviours as well as occasionally offering access to funding for new ventures. Finally, the construction of (entrepreneurial) identity is gendered, favouring men over women. Families are more inclined to send boys than girls to formally learn about business. In addition, women who move into business are expected, by tradition, to combine domestic and professional duties.

Family as an institution: the influence of institutional forces in transgenerational family businesses. To understand how institutional forces affect entrepreneurship across generations, Monticelli *et al.* (2020) study family businesses in the second, third and fourth generations. Through their analysis of primary and data, they examine how the institutional domain (cognitive, regulative or normative) and the institutional forces (mimetic, coercive or normative) are expressed and the extent to which they influence entrepreneurial behaviour. For the second generation, day-to-day learning and relationships between parents and children are central. Mimetic or coercive institutional forces facilitate the inclusion of family members in the family business and the adoption of entrepreneurial behaviours: norms and procedures are implicit. This generation recognises the opportunity it has received but struggles with institutionalisation and segmentation between firm and family.

The third generation, preoccupied by both integrating the tacit knowledge transmitted by the previous generation and the transfer of this knowledge to the next generation, searches for a guided experience and formal education. They extend the formalisation of norms, recognise boundaries between firm and family, and respect and consider the limits beyond the family business. Finally, the fourth generation is not only concerned with the legitimacy and success of the firm, but also with the unity of the family and its legitimacy. Members of this generation engage in professionalising the family firm as an option for achieving a better balance in this relationship. Preferring to search for new challenges, they leave the management of the family firm to a few family members and external professionals.

It is particularly interesting to see that these authors show how, at the beginning, the family is the institution that induces entrepreneurial behaviour of the family business, but over generations, it becomes the family firm that affects the family's behaviours, with the outcome being the transfer of entrepreneurial behaviours across generations.

The effect of institutional transition on entrepreneurial orientation (EO) of family businesses: evidence from India. In their paper, Chakrabarti and Mondal (2020) evaluate the impact of familial factors on EO, investigate how it is likely to change during periods of institution such as pro-market reforms, and whether this differs between stand-alone family businesses and family business groups. They analyse a database of 51,972 observations belonging to 12,250 firms from India across an extended period. The authors position the family as a social institution as driver of EO; this is even more so in contexts like India, which is characterised by institutional voids that include the relative lack of intermediary firms, regulatory systems and contract enforcing mechanisms. In this absence, family provides access to social capital, financial capital and networks of firms for production. The results suggest that family-owned businesses exhibit higher levels of EO than non-family businesses, providing evidence that in contexts of institutional voids, the family does indeed provide a "security net", allowing the firm to be more innovative, risk-taking and proactive than their non-family counterparts. These authors also find that the relationship between family ownership and the EO of family firms is negatively moderated by pro-market reforms, meaning that non-family firms show higher growth in EO during pro-market reforms. In the context of institutional change, the family, rather than being a security net for the firm, hinders its adaptation to these new measures. Finally, Chakrabarti and Mondal (2020) demonstrate that family business groups show higher levels of EO than stand-alone family businesses during pro-market reforms. Indeed, with their unique network-level resource base the former enable them to maintain a high level of EO despite the impetus to adapt to new institutional (market) rules.

This study offers several contributions. First, in contexts of institutional voids, the family provides necessary social and financial capital. Second, longitudinal evidence suggests that in the beginning, the national context was characterised by institutional voids and the family satisfied the needs, and the family was the predominant institutional force that facilitated entrepreneurship. During the period of institutional change, the family became a force hindering entrepreneurship, whereas the family business group became the facilitating force. Opportunities exist for future studies to investigate whether the pro-market reforms, once/if the agents integrate them, become the predominant institutional force facilitating entrepreneurship.

Navigating institutional challenges in Mexico: the role of social capital in entrepreneurial families. The study by Estrada-Robles *et al.* (2020) focusses on the how informal institutional support dynamics, provided through familial relationships and interactions of entrepreneurs, manifest in the context of a weak (formal) institutional environment. Using interviews of 36 individuals from 14 entrepreneurial families, they find that social capital enables access to different types of resources to overcome or reduce the impact of wider institutional challenges on entrepreneurial family members as they pursue their respective entrepreneurial activities. More specifically, they show how entrepreneurial families share and mobilise financial and nonfinancial resources across firms through support enhanced by a shared vision (cognitive dimension); how strong ties in entrepreneurial families enable immediate access to important external networks and connections (structural dimension); and how entrepreneurial families foster information and knowledge exchange (relational dimension) through strong levels of trust and commitment. These three dimensions are interdependent influencing the creation and mobilisations of resources and capabilities within the entrepreneurial family.

This paper offers several noteworthy contributions. First, the authors go beyond the more traditional approaches to family (e.g. nuclear family, household) to study the entrepreneurial family, which is defined as a collective of individuals within a socially constructed family that operates separate ventures outside of a team structure rather than creating or generating firms together. Entrepreneurial families, in their study, can be nuclear or extended in nature, living in a single or multiple households, but they do have a shared familial context. This creates a pathway for further research seeking to understand alternative forms of family. Second, the authors consider the reciprocal flux among the members of the entrepreneurial family, highlighting the influence of both strong (bonding) and weak (bridging) ties. Finally, conducting this study in Mexico, a collectivist culture (where business and family intertwine) is particularly pertinent to unveil family entrepreneurial dynamics.

Institutional influence and the role of family in poor women's micropreneurship. Rather than seeing the family as resource for the business or the business as resource for the family, to understand micropreneurship of resource-constrained women in rural Nigeria, Xiong *et al.* (2020) use the business family as a socio-economic unit of both production and consumption. In other terms, the family is the micro-entrepreneurial unit. With this qualitative study of 15 cases, the authors explore how family relationships influence practices and theorise practice and roles in context. The women studied live in remote areas of Nigeria with no access to the (minimal) formal institutional support offered by the country. These women are subjected to informal institutions: the (extended) family and associated patriarchy, traditions, culture and gender roles, according to which women are expected to generate the income needed for raising their children without having access to property rights, security, education and other resources. Indeed, motivations, resources and outcomes are all family based. The women in their study start their business to satisfy gendered cultural roles imposed by the family. They rely on family resources such as unpaid labour of the children or supplies with delayed payment from their husbands. The women operate their businesses for short-term ("put food on the table every day"), mid-term (pay school fees for the children) and long-term (educate the children so that they can get out of poverty) benefits.

Although these authors focus on the micropreneurship of the women, their data also show how the businesses of the respective husbands are often a source of resources (e.g. produce to sell, feed for their poultry activity, financial resources, etc.). Xiong *et al.* (2020) argue that the informal institutions (specifically that the husband is head of the household and holds the power to inhibit the woman's actions) that dictate the rules of these microentrepreneurs constrain their entrepreneurship, whereas it can also be seen as facilitating in that it allows for short-term but not longer-term goals. This study offers a reminder of the distinction between income entrepreneurship and growth-oriented entrepreneurship as well as the link to the difference between income vs growth and necessity vs opportunity.

Non-family knowledge during family business succession: a cultural understanding. Wasim *et al.* (2020) offer an exploratory study of four cases of family businesses operating in the UK to understand how the (national) culture (according to Hofstede's four initial dimensions) of the business family affects knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer during the succession process. By studying firms operating in the same national institutional environment, but from different ethnic origins, the authors are able to underscore differences among business families, specifically differences related to family (ethnic) culture as informal institution. Wasim *et al.* (2020) find that although all cases wanted to see themselves as collectivist, who actually belonged to the collective differed. In fact, external stakeholders were more associated with the transfer of knowledge than internal stakeholders. More importantly, it is also noted that (high) power distance facilitates knowledge transfer intra-family, and power distance also supports the acceptance of the successor by non-family employees despite a very short succession process.

The insights of this study expand on understanding of how national culture influences planned succession processes. Indeed, historically and quantitatively, the bulk of the family business succession literature is embedded in western cultures, which are characterised by relatively low power distance. Accordingly, successors are often prepared for succession by experiencing different positions before taking the helm. Learning the company by being involved at various levels allows the successor to acquire knowledge and skills, but more importantly, to also garner the esteem of employees who will later be the foundation of their recognition as legitimate leaders. This contrasts with high power distance cultures in which simply belonging to the owning family is sufficient to establish legitimacy.

Where less is more: institutional voids and business families in Sub-Saharan Africa. In their conceptual piece, Murithi *et al.* (2020) seek to identify what role business families play in the institutional environment in Sub-Saharan Africa. By focussing on the family, rather than the business, they demonstrate that dynamics are complementary, rather than competing, and this allows to better navigate in the wider institutional context. They underscore that this institutionally weak environment is conducive the informal entrepreneurship by organisations, and encourages business families to engage formally and informally in institutional entrepreneurship. The weight and complexity of socio-cultural institutions, at which families are the centre, leads families to rely on networks of social relationships in doing business. In this context, families form a specific institution, allowing business families to navigate the voids of the greater institutional context. These authors offer a conceptual model to visualise the specific familial logic in this context as well as the family as an institution.

The key take-away of this paper consists in its robust theoretical demonstration of the complementary forces of institutions. The force and detail with which they relate the complex and heavily binding socio-cultural institutions and how these relay the voids in the greater political-legal environment is very impactful.

The collective contribution of this special issue

As noted in Table II, the collection of papers featured in this special issue provides an intricate picture of the complex institutional elements and mechanisms in family entrepreneurship. Going beyond the dichotomous approaches embraced by previous research, Table II shows how different institutions complement and compete.

We see, for instance, that national cultures permeate and are complemented by other elements and at other levels (reinforcement according to Scott, 2010). In national cultures of high power distance, in which distinct gender roles are important (e.g. Brazil and Nigeria),

Table II. Papers' insights and contribution to the literature on family entrepreneurship

Paper	Country	Level(s)	Element(s)	Property/Process	Contribution
Franco and Piceti	Brazil	Copreneurial couples (micro) Field (family business)	National culture Field code of conduct	Property: the influence of gender in cultural culture	In order to be perceived as competent within the copreneurial venture, the woman must also exercise a professional role/activity outside of the copreneurial venture
Iqwe, Newberry, Amoncar, White and Madichie	Nigeria	Community: Igbo tribe (meso) Individual: young males (micro)	Community culture of entrepreneurship shapes collective training of young males	Property: the role of the tribe to fill institutional voids at the national level	Process if institutional construction of entrepreneurial identities of males
Monticelli, Bernadro and Trez	Brazil	Family (micro), family business (meso), transgenerational family business (meso)	Family culture Precepts of the family business Governance structures	Process: shift in importance of the different levels and elements over time	Process of building transgenerational business family: family to family firm, then family firm to subsequent generations of the family
Chakrabati and Mondal	India	Premarket reforms (macro), influence family business and family business groups (meso)	Practice of entrepreneurial behaviours in the field, moving from one level to another	Property of the meso-level institutions (inducting or hindering entrepreneurship)	During the period of institutional change the family became a force hindering entrepreneurship, whereas the family business group (the network level) became the facilitating force
Estrada-Robles, Williams and Vorly	Mexico	Entrepreneurial families (micro)	National culture	Property of the entrepreneurial families	Process of resources sharing taking into consideration the reciprocal flux among the members of the entrepreneurial family, allowing us to understand simultaneously the influence of both string (bonding) and weak (bridging) ties
Xiong, Ukanwa and Anderson	Nigeria	Business families as micro-entrepreneurial unit (micro)	National culture	Property of the (female led) business family	The effect of the husband, simultaneously hindering through the patriarchal national culture and enabling through synergies between the businesses of the wife and his own
Wasim, Cunningham, Maxwell-Cole and Taylor	UK	Business families from different ethnicities (micro)	National culture	Property of the formalised succession process	In high power distance cultures, simply belonging to the owning family is sufficient to establish legitimacy
Murithi, Vershinina, and Rogers	Sub-Saharan Africa	Sub-Saharan families as an institution embedded in their social context	Regulative: political-legal, normative: socio-cultural	Process: how these embedded institutions complement each other	Conceptual framework

normative elements of a field relay this assumption of difference (Franco and Piceti, 2020) or cognitive-cultural elements on more micro-levels such as within the family reinforce them (Xiong *et al.*, 2020). In collective cultures (or those self-perceived as such), the assumption of "we vs they" is relayed and reinforced on the family level, influencing, for example, which resources are shared and how (Estrada-Robles *et al.*, 2020), and permeates the family firm to influence the process of legitimacy acquisition by the successor (Wasim *et al.*, 2020).

We also see how institutions at different levels interact, contributing to the literature on institutional voids. Indeed, in national contexts that do not offer support for entrepreneurship, families and communities "step-in" to offer this support to their individual members (Iqwe *et al.*, 2020), to the families (Murithi *et al.*, 2020), sometimes unknowingly (Estrada-Robles *et al.*, 2020). When higher-level institutions (national regulatory elements) seek to offer such support, lower institutions (the family in Estrada-Robles *et al.*, 2020 and the family business group in Chakrabarti and Mondal, 2020) constitute alternative and preferred sources of support for families.

Another contribution of this collection of papers is to shed light upon important differences among families, and more importantly offer a variety of lenses with which these differences can be unveiled. Indeed, although the impetus to include differences among families is definitely not new (Yu *et al.*, 2012) and is becoming more pronounced (e.g. Daspit *et al.*, 2018; Jaskiewicz and Dyer, 2017; Memili and Dibrell, 2019), the papers in this special issue offer, both individually and collectively, theoretical frameworks and empirical findings to support such further research. Iqwe *et al.* (2020) and Chakrabarti and Mondal (2020) show differences in family composition, the former including both kindred and kinship (here, the tribe) and the latter based on the perception by the group itself, which is socially constructed. Differences relative to the functioning of the family are shown in Xiong *et al.* (2020), where the authors give a concrete example of how national laws (regulating personal and family matters) impact the roles of different family members (Barrédy, 2016). Iqwe *et al.* (2020) and Monticelli *et al.* (2020) relate different ways in which different types of families induce, through different mechanisms, the entrepreneurial behaviours of the members of the family (Iqwe *et al.*, 2020) or that of the family business (Monticelli *et al.*, 2020). Finally, different families have different ways of sharing resources (Estrada-Robles *et al.*, 2020; Xiong *et al.*, 2020), and different perceptions and processes of successor preparation and legitimisation.

Finally, this collection of papers and guest editorial supports investigations in non-western contexts (Ramirez-Pasillas *et al.*, 2017) that focus on family, entrepreneurship and family business. To this end, we look forward to more future studies that continue to investigate how institutional forces vary in their effect on the business family, family business and family business group.

A research agenda

This collection of papers brings empirical evidence of the importance of broadening the scope of research at the intersection of family, family business and entrepreneurship (Randerson, Bettinelli, Dossena and Fayolle, 2015). Indeed, the impetus for, the support of and the outcomes ensuing from entrepreneurship is complex, yet navigating the complexity is essential to advance research. While this special issue offers insights, the studies simultaneously generate new questions and avenues for further investigation.

For instance, other "snapshots" of specific institutional elements (Scott, 2010) will definitely contribute to a contextualised understanding (Welter, 2011; Zahra and Wright, 2011) of family entrepreneurship. Further research focussing on changes in institutions (composition and relative influence) will be useful to nourish debate in the concerned fields (institution theory, family science, entrepreneurship and family business) but more importantly inform policy on the relevance and effectiveness of proposed reforms. Our specific illustrations of how most extant research holds, unknowingly, fundamental cultural assumptions and preferences (such as masculinity, low power distance and individualism) pave the path for more empirical and theoretical research. Such further research would allow to first, to continue unveiling these assumptions and preferences and second, to build much needed research for those (individuals, firms, economies and policy-makers) that do not embrace the same assumptions and preferences.

Along this line, additional research questions for future consideration include:

RQ1. Which transnational institutions affect entrepreneurial behaviours of the family?

RQ2. How do transnational institutions affect the constitution and functioning of family entrepreneurship? For example, how might formal or informal pressures to not have (or limit the number of) children influence family composition and subsequent entrepreneurial behaviours of the family?

RQ3. What is the relationship between institutional factors that influence the construction of gender, and the ensuing expected roles associated with entrepreneurial behaviours?

RQ4. How do institutional contexts (different elements and different levels) affect entrepreneurial behaviours such as family firm start-up, development, growth, innovation, social capital and corporate entrepreneurship?

RQ5. What institutional contexts support/hinder the family's interactions with external business partners and the consequences on the family firm/group?

RQ6. How are family logics altered by interactions with external stakeholders that may be necessary to overcome institutional constraints?

RQ7. What individual, group, and firm behaviours and outcomes (e.g. employee satisfaction, family harmony, family legacy, succession, innovation, diversification, internationalisation and CSR actions) are affected by institutional contexts and how?

RQ8. Do, and how, institutional factors influence the family's pursuit of family-centred, noneconomic goals and socioemotional wealth?

RQ9. How would the use of family as a meso-level institution support the bridging of the institutional literature and practice-oriented literature, paving the way for family entrepreneuring?

Kathleen Randerson
Business & Society Department, Audencia Business School, Nantes, France
Claire Seaman
Queen Margaret Business School, Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh, UK
Joshua J. Daspit
Department of Management, McCoy College of Business,
Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas, USA, and
Céline Barredy
University Business School of Metz, University of Lorraine, Metz, France

Note

1. Here, the family entrepreneurship context refers to the entrepreneurial behaviours of family businesses, transgenerational family firms, family business groups and business families.

References

Anderson, A. and Gaddefors, J. (2016), "Entrepreneurship as a community phenomenon; reconnecting meanings and place", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 504-518.

Barrédy, C. (2016), "In search of future alternatives for family business: family law contributions through Civil and Common Law comparison", *Futures*, Vol. 75, pp. 44-53.

Bergamaschi, M. and Randerson, K. (2016), "The futures of family businesses and the development of corporate social responsibility", *Futures*, Vol. 75, pp. 54-65.

Bettinelli, C., Fayolle, A. and Randerson, K. (2014), "Family entrepreneurship: a developing field", *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 161-236.

Bruton, G.D., Ahlstrom, D. and Li, H.L. (2010), "Institutional theory and entrepreneurship: where are we now and where do we need to move in the future?", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 421-440.

Chakrabarti, A.B. and Mondal, A. (2020), "The effect of institutional transition on entrepreneurial orientation of family businesses: evidence from India", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 76-97.

Dacin, P.A., Dacin, M.T. and Matear, M. (2010), "Social entrepreneurship: why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 37-57.

Daspit, J.J. and Long, R.G. (2014), "Mitigating moral hazard in entrepreneurial networks: examining structural and relational social capital in East Africa", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 38 No. 6, pp. 1343-1350.

Daspit, J.J., Madison, K., Barnett, T. and Long, R.G. (2018), "The emergence of bifurcation bias from unbalanced families: examining HR practices in the family firm using circumplex theory", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 18-32.

DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W. (1983), "The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 147-160.

Estrada-Robles, M., Williams, N. and Vorley, T. (2020), "Navigating institutional challenges in Mexico: the role of social capital in entrepreneurial families", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 98-120.

Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T. and Stephan, U. (2013), "Entrepreneurship, social capital, and institutions: social and commercial entrepreneurship across nations", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 479-504.

Franco, M. and Piceti, P. (2020), "Family dynamics and gender perspective influencing copreneurship practices: a qualitative analysis in the Brazilian context", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 14-33.

Frank, H., Suess-Reyes, J., Fuetsch, E. and Alexander, K. (2019), "Introducing the enterpriseness of business families: a research agenda", in Memili, E. and Dibrell, C. (Eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Heterogeneity among Family Firms*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, pp. 263-296.

Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*, 2nd ed., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Iqwe, P.A., Newbery, R., Amoncar, N., White, G.R.T. and Madichie, N.O. (2020), "Keeping it in the family: exploring Igbo ethnic entrepreneurial behaviour in Nigeria", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 34-53.

Jaskiewicz, P. and Dyer, W.G. (2017), "Addressing the elephant in the room: disentangling family heterogeneity to advance family business research", *Family Business Review*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 111-118.

Jaskiewicz, P., Heinrichs, K., Rau, S.B. and Reay, T. (2016), "To be or not to be: how family firms manage family and commercial logics in succession", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 781-813.

Javidan, M., House, R.J., Dorfman, P.W., Hanges, P.J. and De Luque, M.S. (2006), "Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: a comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 37 No. 6, pp. 897-914.

Jones, T. and Ram, M. (2012), "Revisiting… ethnic-minority businesses in the United Kingdom: a review of research and policy developments", *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 944-950.

Korosec, R.L. and Berman, E.M. (2006), "Municipal support for social entrepreneurship", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 66 No. 3, pp. 448-462.

Memili, E. and Dibrell, C. (Eds) (2019), *The Palgrave Handbook of Heterogeneity Among Family Firms*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Monticelli, J.M., Bernardo, R. and Trez, G. (2020), "Family as an institution: the influence of institutional forces in transgenerational family businesses", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 54-75.

Murithi, W., Vershinina, N. and Rogers, P. (2020), "Where less is more: institutional voids and business families in Sub-Saharan Africa", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 158-174.

North, D.C. (1991), "Institutions", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 97-112.

Poutziouris, P.Z., Steier, L. and Smyrnios, K.X. (2004), "Guest editorial a commentary on family business entrepreneurial developments", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 10 Nos 1/2, pp. 7-11, available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550410521344

Ramirez-Pasillas, M., Brundin, E. and Markowska, M. (2017), *Contextualizing Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies and Developing Countries*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Randerson, K., Bettinelli, C., Dossena, G. and Fayolle, A. (Eds) (2015), *Family Entrepreneurship: Rethinking the Research Agenda*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Randerson, K., Bettinelli, C., Fayolle, A. and Anderson, A. (2015), "Family entrepreneurship as a field of research: exploring its contours and contents", *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 143-154.

Randerson, K., Dossena, G. and Fayolle, A. (2014), "The futures of family business: Family entrepreneurship", *Futures*, Vol. 75, pp. 36-43.

Scott, W.R. (2001), *Institutions and Organizations*, 2nd ed., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Scott, W.R. (2010), "Reflections: the past and future of research on institutions and institutional change", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 5-21.

Seaman, C., Graham, S. and Ben, R. (2010), "Seduced into the family business", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 16 No. 5, available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/ijebr.2010.16016eaa.001

Seaman, C., Bent, R. and Unis, A. (2016), "Family entrepreneurship culture, entrepreneurial intent, futures and foresight in Scottish Pakistani communities", *Futures*, Vol. 75, pp. 83-91.

Seaman, C., McQuaid, R. and Pearson, M. (2017), "Social networking in family businesses in a local economy", *Local Economy*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 451-466.

Stephan, U. and Uhlaner, L.M. (2010), "Performance-based vs socially supportive culture: a cross-national study of descriptive norms and entrepreneurship", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 41 No. 8, pp. 1347-1364.

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, available at: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0269094217722505

Vorley, T. (2007), "Ethnic entrepreneurship: a theoretical framework", in Dana, L.P. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship: A Co-Evolutionary View on Resource Management*, Edward Elgar, London, pp. 30-41.

Wasim, J., Cunningham, J., Maxwell-Cole, A. and Taylor, J.R. (2020), "Nonfamily knowledge during family business succession: a cultural understanding", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 141-157.

Welter, F. (2011), "Contextualizing entrepreneurship – conceptual challenges and ways forward", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 165-184.

Xiong, L., Ukanwa, I. and Anderson, A.R. (2020), "Institutional influence and the role of family in poor women's micropreneurship", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 122-140.

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 No. 1, pp. 33-57.

Zahra, S.A. and Wright, M. (2011), "Entrepreneurship's next act", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 67-83.