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).
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
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 Gaddeffors, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>FORMAL</th>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational</td>
<td>UN, NATO, Regional Trade Agreements</td>
<td>MNCs professional organisations, implicit codes of conduct of certain professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Law and other codified or non-codified mandatory rules (e.g. precedent or jurisprudence)</td>
<td>Axiom associated with identifying as a member of the concerned nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national (region, field, community, extended family, family business, family business group, religion)</td>
<td>Laws (or rules of equivalent force), family contributions, family contracts, company statutes, articles of association</td>
<td>Community identity, precepts of religions, family identity ensuing from idiosyncratic heritage, industry codes of conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-personal, family</td>
<td>Family constitution, family law, family contract</td>
<td>Professional identity, birth, position among siblings, gender identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. Family entrepreneurship and institutions: levels and constitutive elements
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) focuses on 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 mobilize 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 mobilisation 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level(s)</th>
<th>Element(s)</th>
<th>Property/Process</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franco and Piceti</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Copreneurial couples (micro) Field (family business)</td>
<td>National culture Field code of conduct</td>
<td>Property: the influence of gender in cultural culture</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqwe, Newberry, Amoncar, White and Madichie</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Community: Igbo tribe (meso) Individual: young males (micro)</td>
<td>Community culture of entrepreneurship shapes collective training of young males</td>
<td>Property: the role of the tribe to fill institutional voids at the national level</td>
<td>Process if institutional construction of entrepreneurial identities of males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticelli, Bernadro and Trez</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Family (micro), family business (meso), transgenerational family business (meso)</td>
<td>Family culture Precepts of the family business Governance structures</td>
<td>Process: shift in importance of the different levels and elements over time</td>
<td>Process of building transgenerational business family: family to family firm, then family firm to subsequent generations of the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakrabati and Mondal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Premarket reforms (macro), influence family business and family business groups (meso)</td>
<td>Practice of entrepreneurial behaviours in the field, moving from one level to another</td>
<td>Property of the meso-level institutions (inducting or hindering entrepreneurship)</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrada-Robles, Williams and Vorly</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial families (micro)</td>
<td>National culture</td>
<td>Property of the entrepreneurial families</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiong, Ukanwa and Anderson</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Business families as micro-entrepreneurial unit (micro)</td>
<td>National culture</td>
<td>Property of the (female led) business family</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasim, Cunningham, Maxwell-Cole and Taylor</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Business families from different ethnicities (micro)</td>
<td>National culture</td>
<td>Property of the formalised succession process</td>
<td>In high power distance cultures, simply belonging to the owning family is sufficient to establish legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murithi, Vershinina, and Rogers</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan families as an institution embedded in their social context</td>
<td>Regulative: political-legal, normative: socio-cultural</td>
<td>Process: how these embedded institutions complement each other</td>
<td>Conceptual framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?
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**Note**

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