

Call for Papers

Entrepreneurship & Regional Development

Special Issue

From Family to Families: pushing family entrepreneurship forward

Guest editors: Kathleen Randerson, Hermann Frank, Clay Dibrell, Esra Memili

Submission deadline: April 31, 2017

Family businesses are presented as bounded entities, restricted to businesses directly involving family members (Anderson, Jack and Dodd, 2005) through ownership and/or control, involvement in management of the firm, and/or the wish to pass on the business to the next generation (Chua, Chrisman and Sharma, 1999; Litz, 2008). While research efforts directed toward defining the family firm built the foundation for the field of family business (FB) (to understand what differentiates family firms from non family firms), we still do not know enough about the broader field of family entrepreneurship (FE) (Randerson, Bettinelli, Fayolle and Anderson 2016). This rapidly developing field (Bettinelli, Randerson and Fayolle 2015) embraces a wider perspective, studying the phenomenon at the intersections of the fields of family, family business, and entrepreneurship (Randerson et al, 2015). These authors have identified important blind spots inherent to the traditional approach of family business directly linked to the “family” variable which has until now been considered as ubiquitous around the globe and across time.

Research has demonstrated that the family is an institution which can evolve over time (Aldrich and Cliff, 2003) or according to system of law (Barrédy, 2016). In addition, in most industrialized countries, the nuclear family (a married couple and their dependent children) has become a minority among other forms of families: married couples (who had been previously married to other spouses) with children, couples who are married and have no children, cohabitating partners with and without children, and extended families, including grandparents. Single-parent families, same-sex partnerships, foster families, and other legal guardianships as well as adults linked by biological children are also forms of family, greatly understudied. Studying women entrepreneurs and heads of households is important because they spend more on health, education and nutrition than men (Nichter and Goldmark, 2009) and female-led households are on the rise in developing countries (Horrell and Krishnan, 2007). Once seen as a stable institution, the family can now be seen as a dynamic social system incorporating organizational characteristics (Montgomery, 2008) expressing the “enterpriseness” of business families (Frank, Lueger, Nosé and Suchy 2010).

Although some are convinced that the US model of family (i.e. the nuclear family) would become global model (Forrest Zhang, 2004), it is important to underscore that there are still important differences in family structure across cultures. In China, for example, the family cell of reference is not the nuclear family, but the stem family: parents living with a married child with spouse and children are today at the same level as those married before the communist takeover in 1949 (Forrest Zhang, 2004). In Latino enclaves in the south west border countries (Robles, 2007) as well as in East Africa (Khavul, Bruton, and Wood, 2009) families comprise multiple earners, multiple generations, a large number of dependent children; family and community ties are strong. Religion also influences the conception of

family (Thornton, 1985): this is important because, in 2050 Muslims and Christians will be at parity on a global level, and Islam will be the second religion in the US (Pew Research Center, 2015).

More fundamentally, there are currently two approaches to family: the structural view and the transactional view. Most extant research is embedded in the structural view of the family (Koerner and Fitzpatrick, 2004) meaning that biological and legal ties (e.g. filiation, marriage, legal partnerships) bind together a family group constitutes the foundational assumption (Brannon, Wiklund, and Haynie, 2013, p108). In the transactional view, the family is defined as “a group of intimates who generate a sense of home and group identity, and who experience a shared history and a shared future” (Koerner and Fitzpatrick, 2004, p71). It is important to note that in the transactional view the boundaries of “family” are socially constructed, varying over cultures, generations, and ideology (Koerner and Fitzpatrick, 2002). The time is ripe to explore further the family as a socially constructed group (Von Schlippe and Frank, 2013) and the consequences on FB and FE.

One of the main potential resources of family firms is “familiness”. It can confer competitive advantage to family firms (Chirico, Ireland, and Sirmon, 2011). Recent research captures familiness as multidimensional phenomenon comprising involvement, essence and identity (Frank, Kessler, Rusch, Suess-Reyes, and Weismeier-Sammer, 2016), exploring the consequences of the nuclear family on the familiness of the family firm and has found that, for example family-based brand identity, a sub-section of familiness, can be particularly beneficial to gaining a position in the market (Craig et al., 2008). Eddleston et al. (2008) studied other elements of familiness and in particular reciprocal family altruism and innovative capacity, finding that family firms that invest in innovation and foster altruism in the family are able to be more competitive. But what would be the characteristics of familiness in alternative conceptualizations of family? What would be the resulting unique bundle of resources and the outcomes (both positive and negative) of familiness?

Family involvement in firm management or activities mainly focuses on formal ownership and/or participation in the activities of the FB (Anderson, Jack and Dodd, 2005). Informal participation and entrepreneurial activities, although necessary for starting and sustaining the family firm are understudied. In order to capture this informal participation, Anderson and colleagues leveraged on the network theory. Also, although the family (under any form) is an individual’s first resource, there is a dearth paucity of research on understanding the role and consequence of family in effectual entrepreneurial processes (Sarasvathy et al., 2016).

Therefore, we invite scholars to shed light upon how the diversity of families influences the entrepreneurial behaviours of the individual members of the family, the family, and the family business. Works unveiling the heterogeneous nature of families (e.g. according to geography, transactional or socially constructed, the different roles of different religions) and how these differences affect the “familiness” of the enterprise and how the “enterpriseness” of the family is manifested are welcome.

The editors intend to bring with this Special Issue a significant value to family entrepreneurship researchers, policy-makers and practitioners. Full papers should be submitted by Email Word attachment to Kathleen Randerson (kathleen.randerson@edcparis.edu) or one of the other Guest Editors of the special issue. First page must contain the title, author(s) and contact information for the corresponding author.

For additional guidelines, please see 'Instructions for Authors' from a recent issue of *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* or visit:

<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/tepnauth.asp>.

Papers suitable for publication in the Special Issue will be double-blind reviewed following the ERD's review process guidelines.

Contact information

Please feel free to contact one of the Guest Editors if you have any queries about the Special Issue:

Kathleen Randerson, EDC Paris Business School, (kathleen.randerson@edcparis.edu)

Hermann Frank, WU Vienna, (hermann.frank@wu.ac.at)

Clay Dibrell, University of Mississippi, (cdibrell@bus.olemiss.edu)

Esra Memili, University of North Carolina- Greensboro, (e_memili@uncg.edu)